

THE
PROSPECTIVE REVIEW.

No. X.

ART. I.—CHRISTIANITY AND THE FORMATIVE
ARTS.

1. *Geschichte der bildenden Künste bei den Christlichen Völkern.* Von G. Kinkel. Bonn: 1845. (History of the Formative Arts among Christian Nations. 8vo. First Part. Pp. 240.)
2. *Iconographie Chrétienne.—Histoire de Dieu.* Par M. Didron. Paris: 1843. (Christian Iconography.—History of God. 4to. Pp. 583.)
3. *Sketches of the History of Christian Art.* By Lord Lindsay. 3 Vols. 8vo. London: Murray, 1847.
4. *Die Sage vom Ursprung der Christusbilder.* Von Wilhelm Grimm. Berlin: 1843. (The Legend of the Origin of the Likenesses of Christ. Read before the Royal Academy of Sciences at Berlin. 4to. Pp. 55.)
5. *The Church in the Catacombs: a Description of the Primitive Church of Rome, illustrated by its Sepulchral Remains.* By Charles Maitland, M.D. London: 1846. 8vo. Pp. 312.
6. *Historical and Artistic Illustrations of the Trinity; with Elucidatory Engravings.* By the Rev. J. R. Beard, D.D. London: 1846. 8vo. Pp. 200.

A REMARKABLE change has taken place, within the last quarter of a century—to some extent in England, much more decidedly abroad—in the treatment of all questions that bear upon the history and import of Christianity.

CHRISTIAN TEACHER.—No. 36.

N

By most writers, Catholic and Protestant, for at least two centuries after the Reformation, the stream of history which has its source in the Gospel, was supposed to flow in a channel of its own, parallel with the great tide of human affairs, and distinct from it—the two currents sometimes passing over into each other, and mixing mechanically, but never entering into permanent combination or becoming one substance. In consequence of this separation, Christianity has been surveyed too exclusively under a single point of view; it has been identified with theology and the Church; and its manifold affinities with the general progress of our race have been almost overlooked. More recently a new spirit has sprung up. Men are weary of this narrow, one-sided, aspect of the greatest fact in human history. They have outlived the shallow *moquerie* of the school of Voltaire; but in taking back their faith, are unwilling to let go their humanity, and would fain learn what Christianity is, and what Christianity has done, by tracking its footsteps in the many bypaths that branch off from the broad highway of the Church—by observing how it has penetrated the inner heart of society, and coloured every product of the human mind—every expression of human feeling—laws, manners, literature and art.

To minds of a certain cast the descent may appear humiliating from the high questions of speculative theology, to such manifestations of the religious life as we meet with in popular poetry or in the material forms of symbolism and art. But it is the circulation of the life-blood through these minuter veins, which imparts the ruddy glow of vitality to the complexion of a period. Here we feel the beating pulse, that attests the presence of a living humanity. Theology may pile up a more showy edifice of words on some vague assumption; but here are facts, revealing the actual condition and feeling of multitudes ages ago; and the more diligently all such facts are brought up from the dark abysses of time, and made clearly discernible to the retrospective eye, the more will history lose its bleak and vacant look and kindle into expression, and the phenomena that are spread over its surface, become significant of the deeper life that was once in operation beneath them.

The works, whose titles we have given above—proceeding from writers of very different schools both in this country and on the Continent—bear witness to a widely-diffused and extending interest in inquiries, which illustrate the reciprocal influence of Christianity and the Formative Arts—those arts which express religious ideas or suggest religious sentiments through the medium of material forms.

Kinkel's book is the production of a scholar, who has made it his object to *popularise* in the best sense—that is, to bring within reach of the mass of readers, and to render intelligible and attractive by clear statement and the charm of an easy and flowing style—the combined results of a more recondite learning.—We hail with joy every earnest effort like this, to open the cold dead world of erudition to the genial rays of ordinary humanity. We wish to see the true scholar (not the quack who usurps his name) and the general public, better friends; the one imparting his light, the other giving back their sympathies; and both agreed in the conviction, that the Scholar may live for a purpose noble and excellent in itself, and capable of telling with the happiest effect on the refinement and elevation of those who cannot make study the business of their lives.—Kinkel writes from a well-stored and well-disciplined mind—not crammed for the nonce; with the precision and distinctness, that imply familiarity with his subject and a clear comprehension of the various materials to be employed:—and in his quick sense of the beautiful and venerable, and his ready sympathy with the genius of Christianity, he possesses still higher qualifications of a moral nature for the task which he has undertaken.

The history of Christian Art is divided by him into three periods: the Old Christian, which he carries down to the Tenth Century; the Medieval, which extends from that time to the age of the *Renaissance* as it is called, just before the Reformation; and the Modern, which reaches to the present day. A separate part of the work was to be assigned to each of these periods; and it was announced, that the whole would appear in the course of the last year. But up to the writing of these sheets, we have received only the first part, though we had ordered the remainder of the work to be forwarded to us, as soon as

it came out. We regret the circumstance, as it deprives us of a guide so agreeable and intelligent, through the interesting period of Medieval development, embracing the rise, perfection, and decline of the pointed style of Architecture, and the gradual liberation of Painting from the rigid types in which it had been fixed by the traditions of the Church, into the life and freedom which it assumed under the hands of the great Italian and German masters. It is a disqualification for pronouncing a full judgment on Kinkel's book, that he has postponed to the end of his last part, all reference to his sources and authorities, and therefore given us no direct opportunity of testing his accuracy. Internal indications are strongly in his favour; and we may say, that in going over recently many parts of the field traversed by him, with guides of high repute, Röstel and Raoul-Rochette, we have met with satisfactory confirmation of the general correctness of his statements. Some clear and beautiful lithographic illustrations are appended to his work, which add to its value. We could have wished, they had been more abundant.

The work of Didron, though a whole complete in itself, is one of a great series of publications issued under the direction of the Historical Committee of Arts and Monuments at Paris. This noble undertaking is due to the zeal of M. Guizot for the history and antiquities of his country. In 1831, when Minister of the Interior, he appointed an Inspector General of Historical Monuments. On becoming Minister of Public Instruction in 1835, he created a Sub-committee of Arts; and this was converted in 1837, by the then Minister of Public Instruction, M. Salvandy, into the Committee of Arts and Monuments as it now exists.* The chief value of Didron's volume consists in the engravings, many of which are exceedingly curious, and which he has illustrated learnedly and ingeniously, but in a style far too diffuse and rhetorical for our taste. The information conveyed might be compressed into half the compass—a consideration of some moment with men whose pursuits impose on them the necessity of reading many books. This first volume, which he has entitled "*Histoire de Dieu*," exhibits the Christian sym-

* See the *Annales Archéologiques*. Paris: 1844. p. 180.

bols of the *nimbus* and the *aureola* in their various forms,* and the visible representations, current in the different ages of the Church, both of the separate persons of the Godhead and of their union in the Trinity. These symbols and representations he has classified according to the periods, when they were in vogue; and it is curious to observe how closely their character corresponds to the successive phases of theological opinion, and even to the changes in the general state of manners. With the zeal of the antiquary there is intermingled throughout Didron's work a somewhat ostentatious display of orthodoxy, through which the philosophical character of his own faith is revealed with a transparency that admits of no mistake.†

One of the latest contributions to the history of Christian Art, is contained in the three volumes of Lord Lindsay. These are only the commencement of a more extensive work. The first volume which is introductory, exhibits a view of Christian Mythology, illustrated by specimens from the ancient legends—a general classification of Schools—and a discriminative comparison of early Roman and Byzantine Art. The two following do not embrace more than the first period of the history of Christian Art, from the settlement of the Lombards in Italy till the middle of the 15th century. It is the author's object in this

* Archeology in the French School seems aspiring to the character of a science, and demands of course an appropriate nomenclature. The three words *nimbus*, *aureola* and *gloria* have been used vaguely by former antiquaries. M. Didron thus attempts to discriminate and fix their use. *Nimbus* is the circle, sometimes changed for the square or other angular form, which surrounds the head of the personages of sacred history—in those of a divine character, enclosing the Greek cross.—*Aureola* is a figure of various shape, enveloping the entire body, as the *nimbus*, the head alone—what has been called by English antiquaries, *Vesica piscis*.—*Gloria* is the union of the *nimbus* and the *aureola*. The forms of the symbols so designated vary from age to age.—We do not think M. Didron very happy in his derivations. He considers the word *gloria* as an onomatopœa, an instinctive emission of the two principal vowel sounds of which it is composed—resulting from a strong emotion of admiration. “Il est possible que le mot *gloria*, comme celui de *bravo*, où l'o vient après l'a, ne soit qu'une acclamation bruyante, et que l'expression de l'hommage rendu à un homme de génie,” p. 109. Again, with a strange disregard of all grammatical analogy, he treats *aureola* as the diminutive of *aura*, confounding it with *aurula*, and renders it “souffle lumineux,” “flamme,” (p. 85.) when it is obvious that it properly means the golden crown of glory. The examples in Ducange *sub voc.* show that this was the signification of the word even in medieval Latinity. The distinctions of Didron are therefore quite arbitrary, and introduced in defiance of the real force of terms.

† See pp. 509-512.

comprehensive survey, to indicate the several elements—Byzantine, Classical and Teutonic—which have mingled in the artistic workings of the medieval period, and to trace the filiation of different schools to the combination and antagonism of the mental influences which pervade it. Underneath his survey lies a theory of human nature, which he intended at one time to prefix to the present work, but which he has preferred putting forth in a separate volume. Assuming in this theory the ancient three-fold division of humanity into—*flesh* or *sense*, *mind* or *intellect*, and *spirit*—he attempts to show, that in individuals as in races, one or other of these elements is always predominant, and tends to excess—the perfect balance and harmony of this mental trinity, the *ideal* of humanity, being nowhere realised but in the manhood of Christ; and that, as in the course of human development, the excess of one element is checked by the re-action of the opposite—the progression of society towards the final standard of truth and right is accomplished throughout all history by the antagonism of conflicting tendencies. He finds a confirmation of this theory in his history of Art. It is the leading idea of his book, and the key to his classification of its materials.*

Of this theory—which his Lordship supports by a somewhat loose and superficial generalisation of universal history—we shall not now venture on a more detailed criticism. The worth of the volumes immediately under our notice, which are really interesting and instructive, must be estimated independently of it. Less precise and condensed in statement, less clear in arrangement, less profound and exact in criticism, than Kugler, the author recommends himself strongly to our esteem by the intimate familiarity that he displays with his subject—his judgments in most cases being founded on ocular study and examination—by his extensive erudition, and by the pure and amiable feeling which breathes through every page. Deficient in logical discrimination and philosophic

* Progression by Antagonism: a Theory, involving considerations touching the present position, duties and destiny of Great Britain.—Murray, 1846.

On the early and wide diffusion of a mystic reverence for the number Three, see the introductory matter of Dr. Beard's *Historical and Artistic Illustrations of the Trinity*.

grasp of thought, he is largely endowed with the moral sympathies, which are a condition of the quick sense of what is holy and exalted in Art. He has evidently written, not from the mere wish to make a book, but because a book was the natural vent for the deep enthusiasm with which his subject had possessed him. Some specimens of poetry scattered through the volumes, are pleasing and graceful; they claim no higher merit: but his prose is diffuse and involved, and at times awkwardly colloquial. Belonging to the School, which discerns in Anglicanism the happy medium between the Romanist and the Protestant extremes, his love of Art is religious: he does not disguise his admiration for the tender and contemplative school of Siena, in preference to the more dramatic and masculine vigour of the followers of Giotto; and his beautiful critique on Fra Angelico (vol. iii. pp. 188-200) is the spontaneous expression of warm sympathy with a kindred nature. This work of Lord Lindsay's is one of the many indications of restored feeling for the poetry of religion, which marks our age. So far as we know, it is the first attempt that has appeared in English, to embrace in one connected view the various schools of Christian Art, according to that higher standard of knowledge and criticism, of which Germany and France have already furnished us with so many examples.

The name of Grimm is itself a pledge for the accurate and solid learning of any work, proceeding from either of the two distinguished brothers, whose researches have thrown so much light on the history and antiquities of the German race. In the essay before us, William Grimm has traced back from their completed form in the 13th and 14th centuries, through their successive stages of formation, to the first elements of existence indicated by ecclesiastical history—the two main traditions respecting the likenesses of Christ, which spring respectively, the one in the Greek, and the other in the Latin Church, from the story of Abgarus king of Edessa and his correspondence with Christ, and that of Veronica who had been healed of her bloody issue by touching the hem of the Saviour's robe. The paper is an instructive study in the processes of mythical composition, which were so actively at work through the whole medieval period,—and in this view pos-

sesses a philosophical value for those who consider even the pathology of the human mind to be subject to certain laws that are not unworthy of attention.* The investigations of Grimm, taking up the subject analytically from the matured legends of the Middle Ages, form an important supplement to the earlier labours of Reiske and Jablonski, who beginning with the earliest notices of incipient fable, have not carried their synthesis beyond the 7th or 8th century; and the two sets of inquiries combined bring up the history of the likenesses of Christ almost to the awakening of modern Art in Italy.

England has done comparatively little in researches of this nature since the publication of Middleton's celebrated Letter from Rome, in the first half of the last century.† Dr. Maitland's book on the Catacombs of Rome, has the recommendation of being founded in part on personal observation. He took copies of several of the original monuments, now preserved in the Lapidarian Gallery of the Vatican, with his own hand, and would have made many more, but for the interference of the Jesuits. He has given us from his own copies and from earlier works, very good reduced facsimiles of inscriptions from the subterranean tombs of the ancient Christians, some of which he has ingeniously decyphered. His work in our judgment, would have been improved, had he confined himself to Archeology. He has gratuitously bestowed on it a theological, and even a controversial, character, and overzealously pressed it into the service of Protestantism,—interpolating a good deal of ecclesiastical history, which is neither very profound nor very accurate. In speaking of the last struggle between Christianity and Heathenism, he tells us (p. 237) that “every means *short of actual persecution* was adopted to erase the ancient superstition”—as if Theodosius and Justinian, backed by zealous

* Ce ne sont pas en effet les vérités qui occupent le plus d'espace, ou même qui obtiennent le plus d'importance dans l'histoire de l'humanité; les fables y jouent de toute manière un bien plus grand rôle; et l'on se fait peut-être une plus juste idée d l'homme civilisé en l'étudiant dans les erreurs de sa raison et dans les illusions de son génie, que dans les faits positifs de son histoire. Raoul-Rochette. Premier Mémoire sur les Antiquités Chrétiennes, p. 113.

† It was first published in May, 1729. A fourth edition in 8vo. with a Prefatory Discourse and Postscript appeared in 1741.

bishops, had not persecuted the adherents of the ancient religion! Again (p. 312)—while his book is in great measure written to disprove the claims of the Romanists—he indulges in a rhetorical flourish about “the auspicious hour when the eye of Gregory first rested on the captive Angles,” and when he sent Augustine on “the most successful missionary enterprise ever undertaken by man,” and prays that “our Church may be enabled in turn to spread the blessing:”—though he could hardly have been ignorant, that there were other missionaries at work in the same quarter, and ought to have known, that if ever enterprise were engaged in, with the express view of extending the spiritual dominion of Rome—it was that of Augustine.

The doctrinal design of Dr. Beard's book has unavoidably led him to consider the relations of Christianity with Art and Symbolism, under a single point of view, which is far from conveying an adequate idea of their extent and manifold application. Only the latter part of his volume has any bearing on the subject of this article, and the designs illustrating it, are taken almost entirely from the work of Didron which we have already noticed. If any remark has been suggested to us by the perusal of his volume, it is, that the two elements of which it is composed, the dogmatic and the artistic, have hardly been fused with sufficient care into a homogeneous substance, and that drawn by an active but rapid hand from different sources, they seem rather placed in juxtaposition, than wrought into union by one pervading idea. To many readers, however, his book will present views at once novel and instructive; and the best thanks of the public are due to the learned and indefatigable author, for opening to them a subject which is in this country so imperfectly understood.

We seize the occasion offered us by a notice of these works, to present our readers with a brief survey of the more remarkable developments of a sympathy between Christianity and the Formative Arts. We take our point of view from the religious side of the question; as our immediate concern is rather with Christianity than with Art,—and we aim chiefly at tracing the influence of the former, in directions which have been little attended to by multitudes who feel a deep interest in the general subject

of religion and theology. Our object is neither artistic nor antiquarian. A really instructive article on topics of this nature, were we ever so competent to handle them, could not be produced without the aid of engravings. We must be content, therefore, with exhibiting such general results as the reader will have little difficulty in distinctly conceiving. What we are most desirous he should discern, is the principle of continuous development, which seems by a kind of natural organism to connect in one progressive whole, the various epochs of Art among Christian nations. We shall try to justify our place in the pages of the PROSPECTIVE REVIEW, by using the *past* phenomena of Christian history, as a ground of rational augury as to its *future* course and issue.

Under the Formative Arts, we comprehend Architecture which has its origin in the necessities of habitation—and the Arts more immediately Imitative, whether representing forms on a plain surface, or moulding them wholly or in part out of the solid mass—which spring from the instinctive desire in the human mind of giving permanent expression to every idea by which it is vividly affected. To this latter impulse we owe the arts of Painting and Sculpture. Architecture stands apparently in a closer relation to the utilities of mankind; but it is a fact to be distinctly noticed, that all the three arts which we have called Formative, received their earliest impulse from the religious principle, and under its influence entered into an union and sympathy, which was never afterwards entirely dissolved in either of their two great periods of Heathen and Christian development. Art in its higher sense is not the mere copying of external objects,—it is the expression of an *idea* or a *sentiment* through a material form. This character it derives from its religious origin. The physical wants of life do not possess an interest sufficiently grand and awakening to call it forth; they are satisfied with immediate fruition; and, as if conscious of the meanness of their source, desire no lasting and conspicuous record of their existence. Not till a later period, does luxury borrow from the creations of a higher power, the lustre that sheds a spiritual grace on its elaborate provisions for comfort and self indulgence. In the commencement of Society, before acquired associations have obscured the primary distinctions of things—it

is only a sense of his mysterious relation to the invisible agencies of the Universe, that seems capable of acting with so much force on the imagination and feelings of man, as to give the *idea* a preponderance over all the impressions of sense, and to impel him to seek relief from the bewildering tumult of his emotions, by embodying it in some visible symbol. His intense consciousness of spiritual life peoples the void with forms and acts resembling his own. He fashions the gods in his own image; and surrounds himself with a visionary society of great and wonderful beings, whose name he reveres as a talisman of strength, and in whose honour he puts forth all his resources of tentative skill, guided by the unfolding sense of symmetry and beauty. Thus while his own dwelling is confined and unsubstantial, plain and unadorned, just subserving the necessities of shelter—he rears a colossal pile, court within court, for the house of the Divinity—gigantic statuary lining its avenues and guarding its entrance, and the bright hues and strongly-marked contour of incipient design clothing with a mimic life its interior walls. This propensity to express spiritual conceptions in material forms, whether, as in the East, it remain fixed in a monstrous incorporation of the symbolical with the anthropomorphic, or, as among the Greeks, it disengage itself into the purely human—marks a stage in the process of mental development, though which all nations have passed, the Hebrews themselves not excepted.

It is quite clear from the Old Testament, that the second commandment was not observed to the letter. Representations of fruits and flowers profusely decorated the tabernacle, and the temple of Solomon. Within the sanctuary two images of Cherubim shaded with expanded wings the mercy-seat, and indicated the presence of Jehovah; while figures of the same mysterious beings were raised in relief on the walls and doors, or wrought in the tapestry which hung across the entrance of the Holy of Holies.* Maimonides limited the prohibition of the Decalogue to the human form, and freely conceded the representation of animals, trees and plants.† Even this prohibition related rather to the *medium* of expression, than to the object of

* Exod. xxv. xxvi. 1 Kings vi.

† Münster, Sinnbilder und Kunstvorstell. etc. Einleit. p. 4.

conception itself.* In the sphere of pure imagination—poetry substituted for the arts of design—no people of antiquity ever allowed themselves a freer use of sensuous ideas in their representations of deity, than the Hebrews. The visions of their old prophets exhibit the most distinct and definite outline of anthropomorphic conception.† The image was already there, developed in its full proportions—prepared to start into visible expression and clothe itself in a bodily form—had not the voice of the legislator come between the thought of the poet and the hand of the artist, and intercepted their communication.—By these remarks we do not mean to underrate the consequences of the prohibition. For the conservation and development of pure Monotheism, we believe them to have been all-important. For, when a spiritual idea has once translated itself into a shape cognizable by the outward sense, the limits of its future unfolding are for ever determined by the possibilities of Art. It may reach the beauty which Art can express. It may exhibit the human in its highest *external* perfection: but beyond that point, its growth must be checked by a hard material barrier which cannot be passed. Whereas the pure idea left to itself, and not thus physically circumscribed, may undergo expansion and refinement without limits. For the happiness of mankind, such was the history of the idea of God among the Jews. Before the time of Christ, it had cast off much of the ancient anthropomorphism, and become refined and spiritual. In the second temple, the Cherubim disappeared from the sanctuary, and other symbolical representations were omitted, which had adorned the first.

Meanwhile, the Hellenic mind had been following another direction, and had ended in almost identifying the popular religion with a mere production and reverence of Art. All spiritual life had gone out of its worship, and only the exterior form remained. Among the effects of the preaching of Christianity, was an intermingling and reciprocal modification of the Jewish and Hellenic tendencies—a fact of no little importance in the general history of civilization,

* "Thou shalt not make unto thyself any *graven* image." Exod. xx. 4.

† Compare, among other passages, 1 Kings xxii. 19-22, Isaiah vi. 1-8, and especially Ezekiel i. 26-28, and Daniel vii. 9, 10.

but of marked influence on the development of Christian Art.

It should be noticed, as a natural consequence of the anthropomorphic conceptions of religion, which gave its earliest impulse to Art, that the primitive idea of a Temple was not that of a Meeting-place for fellow-worshippers, but that of a House for God. The cella of the heathen sanctuary and the most holy place of the Hebrew temple, withdrawn into the inmost recess of the sacred edifice, and separated from the profane world by outer courts of intermediate degrees of holiness—were regarded as the proper habitation, in one case, of the embodied manifestation of deity, and, in the other, of the invisible presence that “dwelt between the Cherubim.” With the local residence of the God, the enjoyment of his protection and blessing was believed to be associated; and as among the heathen his departure was sometimes attempted to be hindered by attaching a chain to the leg of the statue, so among the more enlightened Israelites the presence of the ark was considered a certain pledge of success.* These ideas were not without their influence in Christian times: although in Solomon’s dedication prayer† we discern already the awakening of more elevated and spiritual views; and the subsequent erection of synagogues, devoid of the peculiar associations attaching to a temple—wherever the Jewish race was spread—must have tended to break down the old traditional belief, and by making social worship a more prominent feeling in men’s minds than the local presence of deity, have prepared the way for the doctrine of Christ, that acceptable adoration was not confined to place, but might be offered to the Great Paternal Spirit, wherever two or three were gathered together in faith and love.

The first outbreak of Christianity involved a complete disruption of all connection with Art. The pervading idea of the new religion, was the expectation of approaching judgment, for which believers must prepare by lives of the strictest holiness and of entire separation from the fashionable tastes and pursuits of the heathen world. Under such feelings, death was a subject of deeper interest to them than life. It seemed preposterous to think of erecting

* 1 Sam. iv. 3, 4.

† 1 Kings viii. 27.

stately and durable edifices in a scene that must shortly pass away for ever; and, except their private meetings for prayer and mutual exhortation at each other's houses, it was chiefly at the graves of their departed friends—especially of such as had sealed their faith with their blood—that they assembled from time to time for the exercise of social devotion. Cemeteries, therefore, in which Churches were often afterwards erected, were of earlier origin than Churches themselves. There is at least no evidence of public buildings set apart for the worship of the Christians before the middle of the third century. Of Churches in this sense we find no clear trace in Africa as late as the time of Cyprian.* The first approach towards the recognition of a particular building as a Church, consisted probably in fitting up for regular social worship, some spacious apartment in the house of a wealthy Christian. It must have been in a room of this nature, that the simple rites of the primitive society described by Justin Martyr, were performed.† Large entertaining saloons (*triclinia*), well adapted for this purpose, were often found in the dwellings of the rich; and from their size and sumptuous decoration, and resemblance in their general arrangements to the public courts, of which we shall shortly speak—were called by the Romans, as Kinkel informs us,‡ *Basilicæ*. During the first half of the 3rd century, under emperors of syncretistic spirit, such as Heliogabalus and Alexander Severus, and amidst civil troubles which blunted the edge of heathen fanaticism—the Christians rapidly increased in numbers and in boldness; and their ancient places of assembly no longer sufficing to contain them, new and more capacious buildings appear now for the first time to have been raised on independent foundations.§ About the same time, we begin to read of public

* A. D. 250. See Münter, *Primordia Ecclesiæ Africanæ*, p. 34.

† *Apol. i. 57*. At one end of it there was probably a raised platform—(*pulpitum, suggestum*) somewhat resembling the medieval *dais*—for the speakers, and furnished with a simple table of wood, not yet called *ara* or *altare*, for the celebration of the Lord's Supper.

‡ He mentions a specimen still extant in Rome, the *Triclinium Laterani*, built by Pope Leo III. at the beginning of the 9th century. *Gesch. der bild. Künste*, p. 48.

§ Such seems the proper force of Eusebius's language (*Hist. Eccles. viii. 1.*) in speaking of the times before the persecution of Diocletian: *εὐρέας εἰς πᾶντος ἀνὰ πᾶσας τὰς πόλεις ἐκ θεμελίων ἀνίστων ἐκκλησίας*.

Churches in Gaul and Spain and Britain. They were probably still more numerous in the East. In the persecution of Diocletian, a splendid Church which adorned the most beautiful part of the city of Nicomedia in Bithynia, was levelled with the ground.

But the great building of Churches, and the fixation of a type of ecclesiastical architecture, did not commence till after the triumph of Christianity over heathenism, with the accession of Constantine to the empire in the early part of the 4th century. The new religion now found that it had an interest in the present world, as well as in the next; and the fervour of the primitive enthusiasm which had checked all sympathy with literature and art, began sensibly to abate. The effects of this change were at once conspicuous in the whole outward manifestation of Christianity. The rejoicings of the Christians in their altered circumstances, the new Churches they built, and their dedication-feasts—have been dwelt on with an evident zest by Eusebius.* In a speech addressed to Paulinus bishop of Tyre, and evidently composed by himself, he has left us a very minute description of a large and splendid Church erected in that city; through the vague grandiloquence of which we obtain a tolerably distinct view of the general character and distribution of the edifice, and ascertain two facts of no little importance for the history of Sacred Art:—first, the decided abandonment, at this time, of the simple forms of the old synagogue worship, which had been followed by the early Christians, for the model of a proper temple—like that of Jerusalem †—with its successive divisions of increasing sanctity, corresponding to the supposed qualifications of the several grades of worshippers; and secondly, the rudimentary working of that mystic symbolism—finding in the different parts of the material edifice some fitting expression of spiritual truth—which in

* Hist. Eccles. x. 2, 3. —The greatness of the transition is strongly marked in many of his expressions. The old Churches seem to have been a kind of sacred fortresses. He thus contrasts with them the new—*πολὺ κρείττονα τὴν ἀγλαίαν τῶν πάλαι πεπολιορκημένων*. Even in the new Church, built under such favourable auspices at Tyre, the strength of the outer wall—*ὡς ἂν ἀσφαλίστατον εἴη*—indicates the precautions natural after a recent season of persecution.

† Eusebius distinctly likens Constantine to Solomon.

the Middle Ages was reduced to a system and carried to an excess of absurd refinement.*

But it is to the rise of a religious architecture in the West, that our attention is more immediately called. And here it is material to remark, that from the age of Constantine, the fundamental type and ground-plan of the Christian Church, from which it has never deviated through all subsequent periods of architectural development, were determined by the internal arrangement of the Roman Basilica. The Basilicæ were large halls, answering the double purpose of an emporium or exchange and a court of justice, which appear to have been commonly erected in the cities of the West (remains of them are found in Herculaneum and Pompeii), and were often placed in the forum.† Their usual shape was an oblong of length considerably exceeding the breadth. The main entrance from the street was at one end; and down each side of the length of the building were rows of columns, separating the side aisles, which were roofed over, from the central space that was *hypæthral* or open to the sky. This centre was thronged with buyers; while the sellers exposed their wares under shelter within the columns. The further end, opposite the entrance, raised above the general level, and approached by a flight of steps, terminated in an apsis, or semicircular niche, vaulted over with a half cupola, within which was the tribunal of the magistrate. From an elevation of this construction, he could easily be seen and heard from all parts of the edifice. Underneath was a subterranean chamber for the detention of the parties that were to be brought up for examination. Above the lateral colonnades galleries were sometimes erected—the columns being carried up from below to the roof; and between the columns, in front of the gallery, ran a balustrade—over

* See the *Rationale* of Durandus, written in the latter part of the 13th century. Eusebius, with an anticipation of this spirit, compares the material temple with the inward and spiritual temple of the human heart—the ruin and renovation of the one with the ruin and renovation of the other—and its succession of parts from the outer gate to the Apsis at the end of the choir, with the different stages of the Christian life.

† Kinkel has given a very lucid description of them, pp. 51-61. The name seems to have been imported from Athens, where the court at the foot of the Pnyx, in which the Archon Basileus presided, and took cognizance of offences against the state religion—was called Basilica. In this court Socrates was arraigned.

which persons could look down on the busy scene beneath, or, drawing near to the further end, observe what was going on in Court—while merchants and others could withdraw to this upper part for more retired conference. Such in its general plan was the Roman Basilica, modified occasionally in its details—as, for instance, where an apsis was placed at each end.

In the reign of Constantine and afterwards, buildings of this sort, no longer perhaps—in consequence of the change of government and manners—required for their original purpose, appear to have been assigned to the Christians as churches; and the style of construction being once fixed, was perpetuated when new edifices were raised.* The nature of the adaptation is well marked by Kinkel.† In the terminating apsis, elevated above the level of the rest of the building, the bishop's throne took the place of the magistrate's chair, and around him, where the judicial assessors once sate, were ranged the presbyters—the altar occupying the centre between them. On the steps where the lictors had kept order, the deacons were now busy; and the bones of martyrs were religiously preserved in the crypt, where in their lifetime the martyrs themselves had awaited the sentence of blood. In the central nave, now covered in and lighted from the windows of the walls, in the side aisles and in the galleries—were dispersed the various members of the congregation, separated from the clergy, as the buyers and sellers of a former time from the seat of magistracy, by an interposed barrier of lattice-work.

This was the embryo and nascent type of Christian architecture. The feature should be noticed, by which, from its origin, it was distinguished from the Greek and Roman temple. The columns were transferred from the exterior to the interior of the building; the enclosing wall was turned, as it were, inwards; and the peristyle of the heathen sanctuary became the aisle of the Christian

* This seems the most natural explanation of the adaptation of the name and form to a Christian Church. But it is remarkable, that only one example exists of the actual conversion of a *secular* Basilica into a Church (*Quarterly Review*, vol. lxxv. p. 368). The rage for erecting Churches over the supposed graves of Martyrs from the fourth century downwards, led to the removal and dismemberment of the primitive Basilicæ.

† *Gesch. der bild. Kunst.* p. 61.

church. Upon this fundamental plan, altogether of heathen origin, Christian ideas gradually exerted a modifying influence. At the point where the choir or raised platform for the clergy, meets the nave—projections began to shoot out on each side, which expanded at length into a regular transept, and imparted to the edifice the form of a cross. This addition, with the substitution of round arches springing from column to column, in place of the horizontal architrave which at first rested on them—completed the development of the early Roman Basilica.

In Constantinople, where a more Oriental taste prevailed, a new architectural element was introduced. The intersection of the transept with the nave and choir, was surmounted by a cupola.* This form, of which a model had been furnished by the Pantheon at Rome, became, with its various modifications and accompaniments, the distinctive feature of the Byzantine style, which reached its highest point of development in the Church of St. Sophia erected by Justinian at Constantinople in the sixth century. Superior technical skill, a tradition of better times, was required for the perfection of this style; but in general the higher qualities of art were replaced by richness of material and elaborateness of workmanship. Variegated marbles, inlaid work, gold and silver, precious stones—were lavished with unsparing hand on the interior of the churches. A certain compact centralisation, connecting an expanded system of members in graduated subordination with the crowning dome, presents a strong contrast, in this style, to the longitudinal plainness and simplicity of the Roman Basilica.

Although the features which distinguished the Byzantine and the Roman styles, were in time thus broadly distin-

* The form of the Greek cross (of which it is hardly necessary to remark, that the four limbs are equal) distinguishes in general the ground plan of the Byzantine Churches, from that of the Latin. The Byzantine style was chiefly developed by Oriental artists. The architects of Constantine and the two Justinians came out of Asia Minor and the still remoter East. Owing to the wide-spread influence of Greek civilization, the Arabs adopted the cupola with its associated features and carried it with them, as an ornament of their mosques, into the different countries which they conquered. In still subsisting remains of the old Armenian churches, the Byzantine type is plainly discernible. See Hope's *Historical Essay on Architecture*; also Kinkel, pp. 125 and 135.

guished, the separation did not take place at once, and the links of transition may be noticed from one to the other. The Basilica furnished the predominant type even in Constantinople till the time of Justinian, who still retained occasionally in his new edifices some elements of the earlier style. In the old churches of Ravenna, which was the seat of the Exarch and the medium of communication between Italy and the Greek empire, specimens yet exist of the Basilica, as modified by Byzantine influence. Its general arrangement does not differ materially from the Roman, but is marked by greater regularity in the distribution of its parts, and by the absence of a transept. The only point in which it conforms to the western more than to the eastern type, is in the omission of galleries over the side aisles.*

Another form, quite different from those already mentioned—polygonal or circular—was adopted for sepulchral chapels and baptisteries. Of buildings for both these purposes, models already existed in heathen times:—of the former, a specimen still subsists in the tomb of Cæcilia Metella; of the latter, in a swimming bath once attached to the Thermæ of Diocletian, and now the baptistery of a Christian church. These buildings were often crowned with the cupola. In the ancient church there were ordinarily great public baptisms on the vigils of Epiphany, Easter and Whitsuntide; and to accommodate the numbers assembled on such occasions, buildings of considerable size were erected, disjoined from the church, and often placed at the western door of cathedrals—as if to express symbolically, that baptism was the appointed means of admission into the Church. The circular form was afterwards employed in parochial and other churches. In this style Charlemagne built the chapel attached to his palace. Part at least of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem appears to have been circular;† and the reverence with which it was viewed by pilgrims, may have

* Kinkel, p. 107. In the Greek churches the galleries were set apart for the women. Kinkel observes, that the absence of this provision indicates the greater freedom of intercourse between the sexes, which prevailed in the West. This remark must be taken with some limitation; since—anciently at least—the males and females were as carefully separated in the western as in the eastern churches. See Bingham, *Orig. Eccles. B. VIII. Ch. v. Sect. 6.*

† Kinkel, p. 115.

the Middle Ages was reduced to a system and carried to an excess of absurd refinement.*

But it is to the rise of a religious architecture in the West, that our attention is more immediately called. And here it is material to remark, that from the age of Constantine, the fundamental type and ground-plan of the Christian Church, from which it has never deviated through all subsequent periods of architectural development, were determined by the internal arrangement of the Roman Basilica. The Basilicæ were large halls, answering the double purpose of an emporium or exchange and a court of justice, which appear to have been commonly erected in the cities of the West (remains of them are found in Herculaneum and Pompeii), and were often placed in the forum.† Their usual shape was an oblong of length considerably exceeding the breadth. The main entrance from the street was at one end; and down each side of the length of the building were rows of columns, separating the side aisles, which were roofed over, from the central space that was *hypæthral* or open to the sky. This centre was thronged with buyers; while the sellers exposed their wares under shelter within the columns. The further end, opposite the entrance, raised above the general level, and approached by a flight of steps, terminated in an apsis, or semicircular niche, vaulted over with a half cupola, within which was the tribunal of the magistrate. From an elevation of this construction, he could easily be seen and heard from all parts of the edifice. Underneath was a subterranean chamber for the detention of the parties that were to be brought up for examination. Above the lateral colonnades galleries were sometimes erected—the columns being carried up from below to the roof; and between the columns, in front of the gallery, ran a balustrade—over

* See the *Rationale* of Durandus, written in the latter part of the 13th century. Eusebius, with an anticipation of this spirit, compares the material temple with the inward and spiritual temple of the human heart—the ruin and renovation of the one with the ruin and renovation of the other—and its succession of parts from the outer gate to the Apsis at the end of the choir, with the different stages of the Christian life.

† Kinkel has given a very lucid description of them, pp. 51-61. The name seems to have been imported from Athens, where the court at the foot of the Pnyx, in which the Archon Basileus presided, and took cognizance of offences against the state religion—was called Basilica. In this court Socrates was arraigned.

which persons could look down on the busy scene beneath, or, drawing near to the further end, observe what was going on in Court—while merchants and others could withdraw to this upper part for more retired conference. Such in its general plan was the Roman Basilica, modified occasionally in its details—as, for instance, where an apsis was placed at each end.

In the reign of Constantine and afterwards, buildings of this sort, no longer perhaps—in consequence of the change of government and manners—required for their original purpose, appear to have been assigned to the Christians as churches; and the style of construction being once fixed, was perpetuated when new edifices were raised.* The nature of the adaptation is well marked by Kinkel.† In the terminating apsis, elevated above the level of the rest of the building, the bishop's throne took the place of the magistrate's chair, and around him, where the judicial assessors once sate, were ranged the presbyters—the altar occupying the centre between them. On the steps where the lictors had kept order, the deacons were now busy; and the bones of martyrs were religiously preserved in the crypt, where in their lifetime the martyrs themselves had awaited the sentence of blood. In the central nave, now covered in and lighted from the windows of the walls, in the side aisles and in the galleries—were dispersed the various members of the congregation, separated from the clergy, as the buyers and sellers of a former time from the seat of magistracy, by an interposed barrier of lattice-work.

This was the embryo and nascent type of Christian architecture. The feature should be noticed, by which, from its origin, it was distinguished from the Greek and Roman temple. The columns were transferred from the exterior to the interior of the building; the enclosing wall was turned, as it were, inwards; and the peristyle of the heathen sanctuary became the aisle of the Christian

* This seems the most natural explanation of the adaptation of the name and form to a Christian Church. But it is remarkable, that only one example exists of the actual conversion of a *secular* Basilica into a Church (*Quarterly Review*, vol. lxxv. p. 368). The rage for erecting Churches over the supposed graves of Martyrs from the fourth century downwards, led to the removal and dismemberment of the primitive Basilicæ.

† *Gesch. der bild. Kunst.* p. 61.

church. Upon this fundamental plan, altogether of heathen origin, Christian ideas gradually exerted a modifying influence. At the point where the choir or raised platform for the clergy, meets the nave—projections began to shoot out on each side, which expanded at length into a regular transept, and imparted to the edifice the form of a cross. This addition, with the substitution of round arches springing from column to column, in place of the horizontal architrave which at first rested on them—completed the development of the early Roman Basilica.

In Constantinople, where a more Oriental taste prevailed, a new architectural element was introduced. The intersection of the transept with the nave and choir, was surmounted by a cupola.* This form, of which a model had been furnished by the Pantheon at Rome, became, with its various modifications and accompaniments, the distinctive feature of the Byzantine style, which reached its highest point of development in the Church of St. Sophia erected by Justinian at Constantinople in the sixth century. Superior technical skill, a tradition of better times, was required for the perfection of this style; but in general the higher qualities of art were replaced by richness of material and elaborateness of workmanship. Variegated marbles, inlaid work, gold and silver, precious stones—were lavished with unsparing hand on the interior of the churches. A certain compact centralisation, connecting an expanded system of members in graduated subordination with the crowning dome, presents a strong contrast, in this style, to the longitudinal plainness and simplicity of the Roman Basilica.

Although the features which distinguished the Byzantine and the Roman styles, were in time thus broadly distin-

* The form of the Greek cross (of which it is hardly necessary to remark, that the four limbs are equal) distinguishes in general the ground plan of the Byzantine Churches, from that of the Latin. The Byzantine style was chiefly developed by Oriental artists. The architects of Constantine and the two Justinians came out of Asia Minor and the still remoter East. Owing to the wide-spread influence of Greek civilization, the Arabs adopted the cupola with its associated features and carried it with them, as an ornament of their mosques, into the different countries which they conquered. In still subsisting remains of the old Armenian churches, the Byzantine type is plainly discernible. See Hope's *Historical Essay on Architecture*; also Kinkel, pp. 125 and 135.

guished, the separation did not take place at once, and the links of transition may be noticed from one to the other. The Basilica furnished the predominant type even in Constantinople till the time of Justinian, who still retained occasionally in his new edifices some elements of the earlier style. In the old churches of Ravenna, which was the seat of the Exarch and the medium of communication between Italy and the Greek empire, specimens yet exist of the Basilica, as modified by Byzantine influence. Its general arrangement does not differ materially from the Roman, but is marked by greater regularity in the distribution of its parts, and by the absence of a transept. The only point in which it conforms to the western more than to the eastern type, is in the omission of galleries over the side aisles.*

Another form, quite different from those already mentioned—polygonal or circular—was adopted for sepulchral chapels and baptisteries. Of buildings for both these purposes, models already existed in heathen times:—of the former, a specimen still subsists in the tomb of Cæcilia Metella; of the latter, in a swimming bath once attached to the *Thermæ* of Diocletian, and now the baptistery of a Christian church. These buildings were often crowned with the cupola. In the ancient church there were ordinarily great public baptisms on the vigils of Epiphany, Easter and Whitsuntide; and to accommodate the numbers assembled on such occasions, buildings of considerable size were erected, disjoined from the church, and often placed at the western door of cathedrals—as if to express symbolically, that baptism was the appointed means of admission into the Church. The circular form was afterwards employed in parochial and other churches. In this style Charlemagne built the chapel attached to his palace. Part at least of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem appears to have been circular;† and the reverence with which it was viewed by pilgrims, may have

* Kinkel, p. 107. In the Greek churches the galleries were set apart for the women. Kinkel observes, that the absence of this provision indicates the greater freedom of intercourse between the sexes, which prevailed in the West. This remark must be taken with some limitation; since—anciently at least—the males and females were as carefully separated in the western as in the eastern churches. See Bingham, *Orig. Eccles. B. VIII. Ch. v. Sect. 6.*

† Kinkel, p. 115.

contributed to diffuse this taste over Europe. Round churches were frequently erected by the Knights Templars.

For the construction of churches during this early period of Christian architecture, the remains of heathen art were recklessly despoiled. Columns were transferred from ancient temples to the aisles of a Basilica, without the slightest regard to uniformity of order or harmony of design. Yet in spite of the plain flatness and breadth of their exterior, and the incongruous mixture of elements which served for their decoration within—the uniformity of general arrangement and the distinct expression of a steady purpose and clear conception, gave an earnestness and solemnity of character to the primitive churches, which deeply affected the mind.

Let us attempt to picture to ourselves an old Christian church, as it must have appeared on some high festival in the fourth or fifth century.—We approach the western gate from the street ;*—and entering, find ourselves in a spacious quadrangle with cloisters on the four sides. In the centre is a fountain. Scattered around are graves and the monuments of the dead. In one part we observe the excommunicated, doing penance for their sins beneath the open sky;† in another, the unhappy *energumens* or insane, exciting the compassion and prompting the intercessions of the congregation as they pass on to their devotions. Right before us, in the opposite side of the quadrangle, is the door into the Narthex, or first division of the Church, sheltered by a curtain, around which is assembled a crowd of the lame and blind and sick and poor, imploring alms. We lift up the curtain and enter; and within we find collected penitents and infidels, listening to the Service, but not venturing into the Nave, which is fenced off from

* The usual position of churches was from west to east; the altar being at the east end, the entrance at the west. But there were frequent exceptions to this rule, especially in western Christendom. In the Middle Ages, the line of the church was sometimes directed to that point of the horizon, where the sun arose on the feast of the Patron Saint. (Durandus on the Symbolism of Churches, English transl. p. 21, n. 17.) Bingham (VIII. iii. 2) supposes, that the entrance to the Church of Paulinus at Tyre was on the east. It seems to us, that the words of Eusebius may admit of a different interpretation. Eccles. Hist. x. 2.

† The *χεμαζόμενοι* or *hiemantes*.

them. Moving on through these, we cross the sacred threshold, and step along the tessellated pavement of the Nave. What a scene is here! Through a long vista of columns, from which spring rounded arches that sustain the walls of the roof—with aisles, stretching parallel to them on either side—we look to the triumphal arch which terminates it, admitting a view into the sanctuary beyond, and on a transverse beam exhibiting the symbol of the cross. The middle of the Nave is thronged with Neophytes, not yet admitted to the Holy Eucharist, who—we observe—as they enter, prostrate themselves on the Rota, a large circle of porphyry in front of the centre gate; while the Faithful are arranged in the two aisles—the men on the south reverently bowing their bared heads at the Holy Name, and simultaneously ejaculating the deep response—the women on the north, silent and modestly hooded, screened from view within their latticed stalls. Projecting in front of the triumphal arch—closed in with a delicately-wrought balustrade, and elevated by steps above the level of the Nave—is the Choir. Here are the singers, engaged in chanting the service. To the right of the Altar is an Ambo or stone-pulpit, from which the Minister, having read the Gospel and the public prayers, is proceeding to address the people; on the left, corresponding to it, is another—in which sits a Deacon who has already recited the Epistle for the day.* Within the triumphal arch is the Ciborium, canopied with its decorated cupola the altar, on which stand the gold and silver vessels—now covered up from the sight of the Novitiate—containing the consecrated elements of bread and wine. We make our way through the crowd, close to the rails of the Choir; and directly under the Altar, protected by an enclosure of lattice-work—we discern the Crypt, with the steps leading down into it—whence issues the pale and tremulous lustre of a lamp ever burning before the relics of some venerated Martyr. On one side of the Altar, are the seats for the emperor and his ministers—the senators and the magistracy; and in the recess on the opposite side, the screened Matroneum for their ladies, amongst

* For the position and arrangement of the Choir in the primitive Church, see the representation of San Clemente, Rome, in the late Mr. Gally Knight's splendid work 'The Ecclesiastical Architecture of Italy, from Constantine to the fifteenth century'—Plate I. with the accompanying description.

them some nuns of eminent sanctity.* Conspicuous above the Altar, and towering over the assembled multitude of clergy and laity, which he embraces in one view—we discern the bishop, enthroned in the centre of the semicircular Apsis, with his attendant presbyters seated round him on each side.

Here we pause—and lifting up our eyes, behold above us the vision of another world—silent images of events and persons from the Preparatory Dispensation, wrought in mosaic on the walls of the Nave, and moving on in pale and spectral procession towards the grand crisis in man's spiritual history which is marked by the cross of the triumphal arch—and around this, in bolder style, the introductory scenes of the awful drama of the Apocalypse, opening into the new heavens and the new earth, symbolised by the sanctuary beyond the Altar—and there—crowning the central vault, and surrounded by the chief apostles, we see the venerable form of Christ raising his hand in judgment, and awarding his subjects their final doom.†

It will appear, from what we have now said, that the fundamental character of the early Christian architecture—whether in its Italian or in its Byzantine development—was Roman—distinguished by the round arch and the semicircular apsis—by breadth, massiveness and simplicity, both of internal and of external effect—and by the predominance of the horizontal over the perpendicular line.—The German nations who overran the empire of the West, adopted this style, and preserved it in its essential features, till the 12th century. The form of the Basilica, modified occasionally by Byzantine elements, predominated during the whole of this period, in France and on the Rhine, and penetrated into Britain. To the same traditional type Charlemagne adhered, in the churches erected by him at Aix-la-Chapelle and in other places. His age, indeed, shone rather with the last expiring rays of Roman, than with the rising beams of mediæval, art.—As the Lombards,

* This was the usage in some churches; but that High Churchman, Ambrose of Milan, compelled the emperor Theodosius to sit outside the *cancelli* of the Choir; and Sozomen says (H. E. vii. 25) this rule was observed to his own day.

† Kinkel, p. 214. Kugler's History of Painting, Book I. § vii. Gally Knight's Ecclesiastical Architecture of Italy. Introduction.

through their ramified commercial connections, exercised great influence beyond the Alps, and the principal architects came out of Italy during their dominion in that country—some writers have called the transition style which spread over the south of France and the western part of Germany, from the 7th and 8th centuries to the 12th, Lombardic.* It has, perhaps more appropriately, been designated Romanesque.† Old authors who speak of churches erected in Britain in the 7th, 8th, and 9th centuries, call them Basilicæ, and describe their style and construction as Roman.‡

The people who made the most rapid advance in the arts of life in the north of Europe, were the Normans; and the old Basilican style of church building which they found already prevalent in the lands conquered by them—they expanded and improved, without abandoning the original type, by superior workmanship, larger dimensions and richer decoration.§ The transept, often wanting in the earlier structures, they generally added to their churches; and over its intersection with the nave, where the Byzantine cupola was commonly set, they placed a low, square, massive tower for the reception of bells—giving by its incumbent weight, increased strength and solidity to the entire fabric.|| It is obvious, that the

* Hope, *Historical Essay on Architecture*. Lord Lindsay distinguishes between an earlier and a later style of Lombard Architecture. Mr. Gally Knight asserts, that the French churches can in no sense be designated Lombardic, but exhibit another modification of the primitive Roman Style. (Introd.) Indeed, the historical process will be best understood by the general remark, that the transition styles of the West, preceding the pointed, are all different modifications of the Roman, mingled occasionally with Byzantine elements.

† See *Remarks on Church Architecture*, by the Rev. J. L. Petit. 2 vols. London, 1841.

‡ See the passages from Bede and others, quoted in the Rev. J. Bentham's *Remarks on Saxon Churches*, in his *History of the Cathedral of Ely*. Sect. 5. Rickman (*Architecture*, 4th edit.) says that the Basilica of San Paolo, built outside the walls of Rome, and ascribed to Constantine, resembles a Norman building, and that the Norman zigzag is discoverable in the buildings of Diocletian. Compare the windows and arcades in the palace of Theodoric at Ravenna. They are quite Norman. Gally Knight, Plate VII.

§ Mr. Gally Knight has shown, that they employed the pointed style in Sicily before it was used on the continent of Europe. (See *Quarterly Review* for March 1845, p. 344.)

|| Bells were introduced into churches about the 8th or 9th century; but in Italy and the south of France, the campanile or bell-tower usually stood disjoined from the body of the church.

changes introduced by the Normans, were a natural growth out of the earlier style.

To the same principle of gradual internal development, and not to any new idea suddenly taking possession of the mind, we must ascribe the next and more important change—the introduction of the pointed or ogival style. The ingenious theories that have been devised by Warburton, Hall and Murphy, to account for its origin,* appear to us all equally unsatisfactory. When an art is a subject of deep interest, it is not always necessary to look beyond itself, for the sources of the change of style and taste which it successively undergoes. We may often perceive, that some element, latent in it, and harmonising with the spirit of co-existent circumstances, has been called forth, as well by the desire of novelty, as by the perception of propriety and beauty—which precludes the necessity of referring to positive invention, or of supposing direct importation from a distant quarter.†—After the lapse of the first thousand years from the birth of Christ, a new influence passed over the mind of Europe, and medieval civilisation began to assume form and consistency. The Christian hierarchy now acquired its greatest strength and influence. The intelligence that directed society, was wielded by the Church. The Monastic orders became rich and powerful. Universities were founded, and soon thronged by thousands. Scholastic learning was reduced to a system, and cultivated with zeal. Municipal rights were secured. Trades were incorporated. Commerce flourished. Wealth produced its natural effects.—In the bosom of these quickening influences, the Pointed Style—a fitting expression of the genius of the time—shot up and rapidly blossomed into perfection. Height, aspiration towards Heaven, towering pre-eminence over earth—were ideas that mingled deeply and worked powerfully in the sacerdotal enthusiasm of the period; and combining with some obvious necessities of climate,‡ would naturally suggest an exchange of the low gable, the depressed roof and horizontal

* Moller's Essay on the Origin and Progress of Gothic Architecture, pp. 62—70.

† As, for example, from the Mosques of the Saracens, or the Pyramids of Egypt.

‡ See Moller, ch. 4. The high roof and sharp gable are best fitted for throwing off the heavy mass of snow that often falls in a northern winter.

line of the early style, for the pointed gable, the pyramidal roof shooting up into a spire, and a predominant perpendicularity in the line of structural direction: and with this impulse once awakened in the designing mind, the pointed arch of which specimens already existed in the intersection of round arches and in the groined vaulting of crypts, was instinctively appropriated as a mode of construction, which admitted of carrying up buildings to the loftiest height, with the greatest security, the largest insertion of lights in the walls, and the least expensive employment of materials.*

That the ogival style was of gradual introduction—a growth and not an importation—is indicated by the intermixture of the round and the pointed arch in buildings of the 12th century.—In the church of St. Cross near Winchester, built in the reign of Stephen, which Dr. Milner calls “a collection of architectural essays,” the two styles may be seen combined.† The same union is said to be observable in the west front of the Temple Church, built in the time of Henry II.—In some cases we can even trace the transition in progress. In the remains of the old church under the choir at York, referred to the same period, Mr. Bentham has remarked, that the arches, springing from short round pillars, are only just pointed.‡ In England, the new style appears to have superseded the old, in the course of Henry the Third’s reign. If Hope be correct in his notion, that the Arabs borrowed their architecture from the Byzantine or East Roman, the appearance of the horseshoe arch in Moorish buildings, would seem to indicate a development of the same innate tendency towards loftiness and lightness in this remote ramification of the primal type, as is announced by the pointed arch of the north of Europe.§

The rapid and almost simultaneous development of the

* See an article in the *Annales Archéologiques, De la Construction des Edifices Religieux*. The same estimate of the pointed style is ascribed to Wren in the *Parentalia*.

† Milner on the Rise and Progress of the Pointed Arch.

‡ Remarks on Saxon Churches, p. 77.—In an Armenian church on the Black Sea, described by Kinkel, the cupola is supported on arches slightly pointed.

§ Dr. Milner has noticed arches of the horseshoe form in the Church of St. Cross. Essay, p. 126. Rickman (*Architecture*, p. 60) says they are observable also in the Choir of Canterbury.

pointed style in the countries where it flourished, must be ascribed in part to the zeal, the close union, and the connected operation of the various members of the hierarchy, many of whom were accomplished architects and designed the churches erected under their inspection—but still more to the existence of an immense corporation of masons, invested with peculiar privileges and placed under the immediate protection of the Holy See, who worked in concert according to esoteric rules and the principles of an hereditary craft or mystery; and migrating from place to place, under the conduct of a chief or captain, wherever their skill and labour were required, encamped in the vicinity, till their task was completed.* France, England, and Germany have disputed with each other the honour of originating this style. It is a mere question of chronology, of little interest for those, who see in it a natural reflection of the spirit of the age—a spontaneous product of the medieval mind. On the whole, it seems most probable, that it first acquired a fixed and distinctive character in the north of France.† It is admitted by Mr. Gally Knight, that in the changes of architectural taste, France took precedence of England.—This was natural from the political relation of the two countries. Our early Norman kings were the patrons of French, far more than of English, literature and art; and it was in perfect accordance with such circumstances, that Norman artists should be the first to cultivate and diffuse the new style. The cathedrals of Canterbury, Bologna, Prague, Antwerp and Upsal—were wholly or in part their work. Even in the neighbourhood of the Rhine, where the ogival style had more difficulty in establishing itself, and to a late period was resisted by the old Roman, there is evidence that French builders were occasionally

* These were the Free Masons. There is an account of them by Wren—who, at a later period, was one of their Society—in the *Parentalia*. Compare also Hope's *Historical Essay*. The Navigators of our modern Railway System exhibit some resemblance to them; but unfortunately they are not under the same good discipline.

† In the district—of which Paris forms the geographical centre—called by Verneilh (*Origine Française de l'Architecture Ogivale*.—*Annales Archéologiques*) “la France française.” It is a coincidence, not to be overlooked, that the development of the German School of Painting—from the 13th to the 15th century—corresponds to that of the Pointed Style in Architecture; and that both appear to have originated in the northern part of France.—See Kugler's *Hist. of Painting*, Part II. p. 32.

employed.* These however did not maintain their early superiority.—The wars which devastated France in the 14th and 15th centuries, arrested the progress of architecture; and English and German builders acquired the celebrity which the French had previously enjoyed. The Italians, at the time of the 'Renaissance,' who were acquainted with this style only as the production of German hands, called it from them, *Tedesco*.†

The ogival style, in its perfected state—towering pyramidally in a connected system of members from the broad base to the finial of the centre spire—with its aisles and lateral chapels, supporting the main body of the edifice—with its tall clustered shafts, its lofty arches, its high-vaulted roofs, its flying buttresses and its tapering pinnacles—all—in the airy lightness of their structure and the delicacy of their workmanship, attenuating themselves, as it were, with a refined spiritualism, out of the heavy massiveness of earlier forms—its front guarded by tabernacled saints, countenances of strange mien looking down from every projecting corbel table—its receding doorways curiously wrought with mystic sculptures, and the wondrous legends of sacred story gleaming forth in rich hues between the graceful tracery of its windows—may be taken as a visible symbol—an embodiment in stone and glass—of the spirit of the medieval hierarchy, with its ranks and its orders, its multifarious traditions, its rites and practices of various origin and authority, pervaded by a common aim and aspiration, subordinated to one great purpose of spiritual domination, and terminating in the final unity of the papal throne.

When an art has reached a given point of excellence in one direction—if it do not find some new idea to work upon, or evolve some fresh principle of internal develop-

* Verneilh affirms, that there are many churches in the valley of the Rhine, built in the Roman style, which are not anterior to the 13th century. The church of St. Elizabeth, at Marburg, the oldest uniform specimen of the pointed style in Germany, was not completed in 1314. (Lange's *Malerische Ansichten der Monumenten der Gothischen Baukunst*, etc., p. 23.) Salisbury Cathedral, an uniform structure in the correspondent style, was finished in 1258 (Bentham).

† Verneilh. (*Annal. Archéol.*) When the taste for the pure classical arose, the old Christian architecture was designated contemptuously Gothic;—the old Basilican style, with the round arch, being distinguished as *Gotico-Lombardo*; the pointed, as *Gotico-Tedesco*, or, with another theory of its origin, as *Gotico-Arabo*.—See Hope.

ment—it must of necessity decline. Unless it be absolutely stereotyped, the mere effort after higher perfection will corrupt it. *Difficilis in perfecto mora est: naturaliterque, quod procedere non potest, recedit.* The capabilities of this style were now exhausted. Before the close of the 15th century, we perceive a tendency to revert from the perpendicular structure, in which such consummate beauty had been attained, to the horizontal line. Further progress moreover was checked by the two most powerful impulses of the age—the revival of classical studies within the church itself, and the movement of reformation external to it. A transition period ensued, marked by a style, which aimed at combining pure Greek and Roman elements with the forms and general effect of medieval architecture, and which has been called, from the century when it flourished, *Cinquecento*. The strong reaction in favour of the Catholic hierarchy, of which the followers of Loyola were the most effective instruments—could not bring back the undoubting enthusiasm and deep consciousness of spiritual power, in which the inspiration of the pointed style had its source.—The policy of the Jesuits was cautious and calculating, and involved concession to the necessities of the times. Their churches wanted the noble simplicity and grandeur of the ancient edifices, and were often showy and meretricious. The progress of refinement in the most cultivated nations of Europe, produced an increasing reverence for classical models, and a proportionate contempt for every style that was vaguely distinguished from them as Gothic. This feeling is very conspicuous about the time of our own Revolution. Addison's letters are full of it. It swayed powerfully the noble mind of Wren, equally imbued with the spirit of exact science and an admiration of classical simplicity, and hindered him from appreciating the lofty design and picturesque richness of effect, so characteristic of the old ecclesiastical style. In the course of the eighteenth century, the taste for medieval architecture, or the Gothic, as it was then generally called—revived.—Warburton and Thomas Warton—to omit other names—afford evident proof of it in their writings.—At present, the veneration for every monument of the Middle Ages has become a passion—we might truly say, a folly. With

all this, we have no architecture of our own. Creation and genius seem gone.—We take our models from the remains of classical antiquity, or from buildings of the mediæval period ; and out of these, we contrive to meet our wants and satisfy our taste. But in this beautiful art, the religious spirit of the nineteenth century is without a symbol and a representative.

In Christian as in heathen times, the edifices of religion have always been the chief receptacles of the works of Sculpture and Design. It should be remarked, however, that the Christians possessed the rudiments at least of a sacred art, before they had any public temples.—This arose from the circumstances of the infant Church. It had broken with the present world, which, it believed, would shortly be consumed in the flames of divine judgment ; its inheritance was in the future ; its home beyond the grave. Death was to it a nearer reality than life ; and thus the cemetery became a gathering-point of deep and solemn interest, where the most affecting rites were performed—hallowed by the cherished dust confided to it—while believers still met for the ordinary purposes of social devotion—as locality or convenience might direct—in some private dwelling. The fraternal spirit of the primitive Christians mingled largely in their feelings respecting interment. To share in the hopes and privileges of their faith, annihilated with them every other distinction. The family burying-places so jealously guarded by the pride of heathenism, seemed in their eyes an invasion of the spiritual equality of the Gospel. Brothers lay down to rest, side by side, in a common grave—rejoicing in their separation from the defiling contact of heathenism, and expecting together the resurrection of the just. Under such influences Christian art arose.—While that of heathenism revelled in the forms of a luxuriant life, and shone resplendent in the eye of day, and invited to the delights of sense—it bloomed forth pale and unnoticed in the dimness of the tomb, and gave beauty to the memorials of the dead, and breathed the holy earnestness of religious reverence and trust.

Some obscurity hangs over the original connection of the subterraneous excavations called Catacombs, with the cemeteries of the early Christians. But the fact is undoubted, that beneath the great cities of the ancient world

—Rome, Naples, Syracuse, Alexandria and Antioch—passages of vast extent had been hollowed out, probably in obtaining sand and other materials for building, which served as places of retreat and burial for the adherents of a persecuted faith. The monuments of the primeval Church are most abundant and best known in the Catacombs of Rome—which stretch out under the suburbs of the city, generally in the direction of the ancient highways—especially in those adjoining the Basilica of San Sebastiano, near the Appian Way, to which the name *Catacumba* was at first exclusively applied.* The works of art in these vaults—chiefly bas-reliefs on sarcophagi, and paintings in fresco or distemper on the walls—are of various date—the earlier being sometimes removed or effaced, to make way for the later:—and by a contrivance not uncommon in the history of the Church, the remains of ancient martyrs who had perished elsewhere, perhaps only their names and memorials, were transferred to the Catacombs, to confer on them a higher sanctity.

There is no satisfactory evidence of these excavations being used by Christians for interment, before the beginning of the second century. During the tranquil interval, which marked the first half of the third century, Pope Calixtus enlarged and adorned them; gave them a more regular construction; and formed in them subterranean chapels, furnished with altars and terminating in conical roofs, for the celebration of religious rites. These additional works were called *Novæ Cryptæ*; and the whole cemetery, above which the church of St. Sebastian was built, acquired the name of Calixtus, and continued for a long time the chief burial place of his successors. We have an account of the Catacombs, as they appeared in the fourth and fifth century, when they had become objects of religious veneration, in several ancient writers. Jerome, when

* This name nowhere occurs in the ancient cemeteries. It first makes its appearance about the time of Gregory the Great, at the end of the sixth century. To the thirteenth, it designated the excavated ground near the Church of St. Sebastian, and still later, the Crypt or subterranean chapel under it. Its present wide application to all excavations of a similar kind, is altogether of modern origin. See Maitland's *Church in the Catacombs*. Röstel (*Rom's Katakomben und deren Allerthümer*, in Platner and Bunsen's *Beschreibung der Stadt Rom*. I. iii. 3) observes, that the Greek composition of the term betrays its Christian origin.

a boy at Rome, used often to visit them on Sundays with his school-fellows; and in a well-known passage, has vividly described their deep impression on his youthful mind.* Prudentius in a more florid style confirms his representation.† The winding passages were lighted at intervals by apertures from above; on each side were horizontal cavities, arranged in tiers, for the reception of the dead, and closed up with marble slabs, on which were inscribed the name and parentage of the deceased, symbols of various form and signification, and particulars respecting the purchase and possession of the grave. At the back of the larger tombs, were placed sarcophagi—which are invariably of more recent date and subsequent to the age of Constantine. Extending to the front of the recess was a level surface, which answered the purpose of an altar, and sometimes of a table for the celebration of martyr-feasts or the memorials of the dead. In the unoccupied spaces of these niches, and on the vaulted roofs and the walls of the chapels in which, as in a common centre, the passages often terminated—were the paintings, now almost effaced by time, which expressed the feelings of the ancient Church and marked the faint dawning of Christian art.

It is very improbable, that these cemeteries were ever the ordinary places of worship,—still less, that they were, for any length of time, the residence, of Christians. They furnished in seasons of persecution, a temporary retreat; and from the peculiar feelings entertained by the early believers towards their brethren who had died in the faith, they were the scene of occasional religious services.‡ Some

* In Ezekiel, c. 40.

† *Haud procul extremo culta ad pomœria vallo*
Mersa latebrosis crypta patet foveis:
Hujus in occultum gradibus via prona reflexis
Ire per anfractus luce latente docet.
Primas namque fores summo tenus intrat hiatu,
Illustratque dies limina vestibuli.
Inde ubi progressu facili nigrescere visa est
Nox obscura loci per specus ambiguum,
Occurrunt cæsis inmissa foramina tectis,
Quæ jaciunt claros antra super radios.

Passio Hippolyti Martyris, 153—62.

The remains of Hippolytus were deposited in the Veranian Crypt in the Via Tiburtina. In lines 219—26 is a very graphic picture of the interior of the old Basilica, built over the Crypt where the martyr-feast was celebrated.

‡ See Prudent. *Passio Hippolyt.* 211 et seq.

martyrdoms also may have been undergone in them. We learn from Cyprian, that in 259 A.D. Pope Sixtus II. suffered in the cemetery;* but there can be no doubt, that after the time of Constantine, when martyrdom was invested with the romantic glories of a bygone age, many vague traditions of this sort were attached to the Catacombs, which had no foundation in fact. Here the Eucharist and the Agapæ were sometimes celebrated; and from the occurrence of wells in them, over one of which was a representation of John baptizing in Jordan, it has been concluded, that here too Baptism was occasionally administered.—Invested with so many interesting associations—their medium of intercourse with an invisible world—the cemeteries were an unfailing source of enthusiasm for the early Christians—where they renovated their waning zeal, and with mingling prayers and vows, in the presence of the glorified dead, inspired themselves with a higher courage and devotion to go forth and propagate their faith in defiance of persecution and death. From perceiving the effect of such meetings on excitable spirits, assembled by dim lamplight in sepulchral vaults—some emperors forbade the Christians all access to their cemeteries.

The Paintings and Sculptures which have been discovered in the Catacombs, resolve themselves into three classes, which bear internal evidence of belonging to different periods. There are first the symbols—single images, borrowed from nature or common life—such as the Palm, the Dove, the Fish, the Ship, the Anchor, or the Good Shepherd bearing on his shoulders the lost sheep—which we find in the receptacles of the dead, depicted on the exterior slab or the inner walls—as significant of some idea or feeling of the Christian faith. With these are intermixed, signs of the occupation of the deceased—sometimes the implements themselves within the tomb—the axe, the saw, the prong of a cook—mistaken in aftertimes for the instruments of martyrdom, and made the occasion of many a harrowing legend. To these were sometimes added a kind of rebus, expressing the name of an individual, such as Onager, Porcella, Vitulus—by the figure of the animal bearing the same.† These representations must

* Epist. 80 ad Successum. Quoted by Röstel.

† See Raoul-Rochette, Second Mémoire sur les Antiquités Chrétiennes.

be referred to the earliest period; though having been once introduced, they were perpetuated to later times.—We must class next to these, historical types from the Old Testament—Noah, Moses, Daniel, Jonah, Job—expressing similar ideas, and having the same reference to Gospel hopes and principles, with the preceding symbols—and marking in this early stage of Christian art, a transition from the symbolical to the historical.—Some feeling—perhaps of reverence, or of a want of fixedness in their own conceptions—seems to have withheld the Christians of the three first centuries from depicting subjects from the New Testament. These form the latest class of paintings in the Catacombs. The most recent of all, betraying an evident conformity to types that became fixed in the Middle Ages, are those found in the Crypt beneath the Flaminian Way, that bears the name of Pope Julius. These are referred by Kinkel to the 11th century; and it is observable, that here for the first time among these works of subterranean art, occurs the representation of a Martyrdom.* Generally in the Catacombs, Christ is depicted in his divine character—in his miracles of healing and blessing—as the hero of the new religion. Few scenes are taken from the common events of the New Testament; and the agony, the flagellation, the passion—on which the stern spirit of the Middle Ages loved to dwell—never appear at all.†

But the most remarkable and even startling fact connected with the Catacombs, is the constant occurrence of heathen symbols and images and forms of expression, among the undoubted memorials of the Christian dead. As the Christian Church assumed for its fundamental type the plan of the Roman basilica, so the earliest breath of Christian sculpture and design passed into heathen shapes, and gave them a new and higher significance. This fact is so clearly established, and with such an array of evidence, by Raoul-Rochette in his three memoirs on Christian Antiquities communicated to the Academy of Inscriptions and Belles Lettres, that it can no longer lie open to question. The proofs indeed are so strong, that some writers,

* Kinkel, p. 203.—The subjects of representation corresponded with the progress of theological opinion. It was after the Nestorian Controversy, that the Nativity and scenes respecting the Virgin, were introduced.

† Raoul-Rochette, *Premier Mém.*

unable to resist them, have contended that the Catacombs must have been used as burial places by heathens as well as by Christians. This, in itself improbable, is denied in the most explicit terms, with all the authority of a thorough knowledge of the subject, by Raoul-Rochette.* Symbols supposed to be peculiarly Christian in their origin and application—the Palm, the Crown, the Anchor, even the Ship in full sail, and the Fish—he has shown were already in use among the heathens.† Even where the elements of a composition were Christian, and taken from the Old or New Testament, the grouping and accessories were always determined by heathen types. In the family tomb of the Nasos, hewn out of rock in the neighbourhood of Rome, the roof and sides are divided into compartments and painted with mythological subjects, in the identical style which has been adopted in the Christian chapels of the Catacombs. Symbolism—or the signification of moral ideas under material forms—was wrought into the very substance of the antique mind. It was the medium through which on many subjects the multitude conceived and reflected. It had become to them a sort of universal language; so that when any new idea entered their circle of thought, it was only by some fresh application or fresh combination of these familiar characters, that they could give it a visible expression. What was at first adopted from necessity or unconscious sympathy, was afterwards retained from deliberate choice or the affection engendered by long association. Thus the types of heathenism passed into Christianity. Thus the transition was imperceptibly effected—a new spirit working under the same forms—from the art of antiquity to that of the new world which was conceived in the medieval womb. In the Catacombs, says Raoul-Rochette, the ancient and the Christian civilisation

* S'il y a une vérité démontrée pour tout homme qui a fait de l'observation des Catacombes de Rome, le sujet d'une étude sérieuse et impartiale, c'est que ces souterrains dans leur état actuel, sont exclusivement des cimetières Chrétiens; et ce qui n'est pas moins évident aux yeux d'un critique éclairé, c'est que tous les éléments de leur décoration, sans en excepter les marbres et autres monuments antiques qui s'y rencontrent, ont été appropriés à une intention Chrétienne, en recevant un emploi Chrétien. *Troisième Mémoire*, p. 241.

† Clemens Alexandrinus (*Pædag. Lib. iii.*) in a passage quoted by Röstell (i. p. 391.) refers to the heathen use of some of these symbols, and recommends Christians to wear them on their seal-rings in their own sense. It is stated by Raoul-Rochette in his second *Mémoire*, that the image of the Ship has been found in a heathen tomb recently opened at Pompeii.

touch and interpenetrate each other: *c'était le dernier chapitre de l'histoire de l'Art antique*.*

Our limits will permit us to adduce only one instance of this remarkable accommodation. If there be any image, which we should *à priori* have concluded must in origin and spirit be exclusively Christian, it would be that of the Good Shepherd—so accordant with our conception of Him who came to seek and to save that which was lost—and seeming so naturally to reflect the meaning of some of his most beautiful comparisons and parables. And so the early Christians evidently thought. No image, if we except perhaps the Fish, do we find more frequently repeated. To none are there more constant allusions in ancient writers. Tertullian, at the end of the second century, speaks of it as a decoration of cups.†—But what is the fact? We meet with the very counterpart of this image in works of heathen art, long anterior to the Christian decoration of the Catacombs. Pausanias has described a statue, which he saw at Tanagra in Bœotia, the work of Calamis in the finest period of Greek Art—the age of Phidias—which was evidently the original type. The same figure makes its appearance in the tomb of the Nasos before referred to, surrounded by the emblems of the four Seasons. It occurs in other instances, mentioned by Raoul-Rochette, as an embellishment of heathen tombs; a circumstance which has puzzled the interpreters and led them to regard the figure as copied from the Christian original.‡ The image of Orpheus attired in Phrygian costume, and playing on his lyre to the wondering animals, in the midst of scenes from the Old Testament,§ is another example of adaptation to Christian ideas, which was perhaps favoured by the strange intermixture of traditions from every source, put in circulation by supposititious works of various origin, like the Sibylline verses.

The ancients invested their sepulchres with cheerful and

* Trois. Mém.

† In two passages of his treatise *De Pudicitia*, c. 7. v. 10 (quoted by Münter, *Sinnbilder und Kunstvorst.* p. 60), with the disapproval however, to be expected from his rigid Montanism.

‡ In a vignette appended to the ninth eclogue of Virgil, Heyne has given from the antique, a figure resembling the Good Shepherd as depicted on Christian monuments. Prefixed to the seventh, is another form of the same general type.

§ Kinkel has given a lithograph and description of this painting.

attractive images, and arrayed death itself rather in a gentle and soothing, than in a hideous aspect. The paintings in the Christian cemeteries have caught this spirit, and breathe an air of serenity and peace. It is observed by Raoul-Rochette, in a beautiful tribute to the character of the early Christians, that although these gloomy vaults were first occupied and decorated by them in the time of persecution and suffering, not a trace can be detected on their walls of the feelings of gloom and despair, or of malignity and vengeance. They seem to have been tenanted by loving and hopeful beings, who were glad of suffering in the cause of humanity, and looked on death not with terror but with joy, as the sure passage to a world of blessed spirits. It was not till Christianity had survived the *reality* of martyrdoms, that it began to delight in pictures of them,—that its spirit became stern and gloomy—and Art sympathising with it, effaced the mild, benignant figure of the Good Shepherd, to make room for the darker images of the crown of thorns, and the bloody sweat, and the agony of the Cross.*

* The writing, spelling, and other particulars of the inscriptions in the Catacombs, indicate that many of the Christians interred there, must have been of a very humble class, able to read only with difficulty, or perhaps not at all. Employing the usual hands for the incision of their sepulchral stones, who naturally followed the traditional forms, they were perhaps hardly aware what some of these really meant. The letters D. M. or D. M. S. are frequently found at the head of an inscription. In any other situation, it would have been at once seen, that this was the customary heathen form, *Dis Manibus*, *Dis Manibus Sacrum*. But as this occurred in a Christian cemetery, such a meaning was supposed to be impossible, though Mabillon, superior to the prejudices of his order, suspected it; till at length the Jesuit Lupi found the heathen form at full length on a Christian tomb. The Catholics had explained the letters, as *Deo Maximo Sancto*. Protestants, like Burnet, denied that the tombs belonged to Christians. Raoul-Rochette has furnished the true solution of the difficulty, by showing that the early Christians adopted heathen forms and heathen symbols to a far greater extent, than even Münter or Röstel have been aware.

A wrong direction was given at first to inquiries on this subject, by the circumstances under which the Catacombs were again brought into notice, in the Pontificate of Sixtus V., amidst the intense reaction of Catholic feeling, produced by the Reformation, towards the martyrs of the early Church.

The Catacombs were regarded as the resting-place of their remains, and every monument or inscription discovered there, was revered with indiscriminate enthusiasm, as deriving a sanctity from them. Cardinal Borromeo and Philippo Neri passed whole nights in prayer in these gloomy vaults; and water was fetched from their subterranean wells for the healing of the sick. Mabillon had expressed a doubt, whether this universal reference to the martyrs could be justified; but was compelled by the strength of Catholic feeling, in a second edition to retract it. The Protestants disgusted with this superstition, but as much prejudiced in their way, were disposed to deny, that

In the meantime, the artistic tendencies of the new faith were not entirely confined to the dim chambers of the Catacombs. Beyond the limits of the stricter Society, which adhered to the simple faith and practice of the apostles, there existed in the second century a numerous class of persons who united with profound veneration for the person of Christ and strong admiration of his teachings, an equal attachment to the speculative doctrines of some pagan school, and an unwillingness to renounce the fashionable tastes and pursuits of their time. These were the philosophical believers—Gnostics, as they were then called—whose influence, shading off the abrupt line of separation between pure Christianity and gross heathenism, was far wider and deeper, and left more lasting traces on the Church, than has been yet perhaps sufficiently acknowledged. These men imported from the lecture-rooms of the popular sophists, a great love of art—and especially the reigning passion for collecting the likenesses of eminent sages and philosophers, which admiring students hung up in their chambers, and sometimes had embossed on their cups and their seal-rings.* Hence, it has been remarked by Heyne,† among the remains of ancient art, we have so many busts of the chiefs and founders of different philosophical schools. It is not surprising, in the wide prevalence of the syncretistic spirit, that the head of Christ should find a place among those of Orpheus, Homer, and Pythagoras. Every one who has read the history of the second century, is aware, that the emperor Alexander Severus set up the busts of these eminent personages in his *Lararium* or private chapel, where he duly offered them mystic rites. The Carpocratians are the first Gnostic sect, who are mentioned as having busts or portraits of Christ, which they pretended were derived from an original, once possessed by Pilate. The authenticity of the other likenesses associated with it, probably rested on no better foundation. Augustine speaks of one Marcellina, a follower

Christianity had any connection with the relics and traditions of the Catacombs. In these divergent extremes of opinion, the true view of Christian antiquity was lost.

* This taste was long anterior to the second century. Cicero, speaking of the admirers of Epicurus, says (*De Finib. v. 1*), 'Cujus imaginem non modo in tabulis—sed etiam in poculis et annulis habent.'

† *Opuscul. vi. De Christi effigie, etc.*

of the Carpocratians, and a great collector of the images of distinguished men, heathen and Jewish—to whom he ascribes the general introduction of them among Christians.*

But the vast and overwhelming incursion of Art into Christianity, did not take place till after the conversion of Constantine. That event broke down the barriers which had hitherto fenced in the Christians as a peculiar people; and multitudes of worldly-minded persons, who had no convictions of their own, but liked to swim with the stream, at once embraced the religion of the State, and effected a fusion of ideas and sentiments, which while it extended the nominal superficies of the Church, neutralised the distinctive quality of its vital principle. Heathen forms grew over and imperceptibly incrustated every manifestation of the religious life—often with a mere change of name, or the substitution of a superstition but slightly differing from that which they had anciently represented. To conceive of the process which now ensued, we must recollect how completely the whole life of the ancients was enveloped with Art—how its symbolism had penetrated into the very interior of their domestic usages, and had become from habitude less a luxury than a species of mental necessity. The walls of their houses, their furniture, their ordinary utensils, their rings and the other ornaments of their persons—bore witness to the symbolical atmosphere of thought and feeling in which they habitually lived and breathed. Cargoes of busts and statues—of every size and shape and significance—were regularly shipped from the ports of Greece for the cities of the West, with the same certainty of finding purchasers,† as the latest productions of Dickens and Bulwer, of Alexandre Dumas and Eugene Sue, are now exported from London and Paris to the great bookselling houses of Boston and New York. Yielding to this resistless tendency, Christianity accepted the form and substituted its own interpretation.‡

* Jablonski. *De origine imaginum Christi in ecclesia Christiana*. Opuscul. iii. p. 377.

† See the *Charicles* of Bekker.

‡ Speaking of certain engraved stones, which exhibited the heads of Serapis and Jupiter Ammon—understood symbolically of Christ—Jablonski remarks; “*hæ gemmæ condocent, earum auctores symbola quidem Theologiæ Paganicæ retinere, sed ea ad Theologiam Christianam transferre, atque modo in scholis suis recepto applicare.*” *De origin. im. Christ.*

The symbols and representations which had been hidden in subterranean crypts, were now brought forth into open day. Among other works with which Constantine adorned the fountains in the centre of the Forum of his new capital, Eusebius mentions figures of the Good Shepherd and of Daniel with the lions; and he further tells us, that in the most conspicuous part of the palace, the emperor caused the symbol of Christ's passion to be wrought in mosaic of precious stones on a ground of gold—as a talismanic protection of the imperial dwelling.* The intermixture of figures thus unequivocally Christian, with others of heathen origin and significance—as the colossal statue of Apollo on a lofty column in the Forum †—must be attributed in part to the lingering predilections of Constantine for heathenism, especially for the worship of Apollo—in part to the inability of the artists of that age to execute works at all comparable to those which existed in heathen temples, and which were therefore removed from their ancient sites to adorn a Christian city.

Of the subjects which were now employed for the interior decoration of Churches, most were either purely symbolical, or else representations of certain passages in the Old Testament, which, from the prevalent mode of interpretation by type and antitype, were themselves understood rather symbolically than historically.‡ Some bishops in whom the anti-idolatrous feeling of primitive Christianity was still strong, were alarmed at these tendencies. Eusebius checked the eagerness of Constantia, a sister of the Emperor, to obtain a likeness of Christ, and warned her against the danger of idolatry. In the same century, Epiphanius, a Cyprian bishop, finding a curtain before the entrance of some church in Palestine, on which was depicted the figure of Christ or a Saint, tore it down with holy indignation, and ordered it to be used as a burying-cloth for the corpse of some poor Christian. But the

* *φυλακτήριον βασιλείας*. De Vit. Constant. iii. 49.

† See the description of it in Gibbon, Ch. xvii.

‡ Before churches began to be generally ornamented in this way, images of the Cross and other divine symbols, even figures of Christ and his chief apostles, appear to have been sometimes represented on the walls of private dwelling-houses, and embroidered on garments. Women gratified their love of display, and at the same time expressed their piety, by wearing robes on which some sacred history was inwrought. See Hase, *Kirchen-Gesch.* § 140.

movement of the age in this direction was too powerful to be long effectually resisted. The circle of artistic representations was constantly enlarged by the increasing reverence for the martyrs, whose sufferings formed the subject of a new style of poetry,* and in the churches were described with rival brilliancy of colouring and strength of outline, in orations pronounced by a Basil or a Gregory from the pulpit, and in pictures which glowed on the walls.

There is not a more startling phenomenon in the history of Christianity, or one that more clearly proves how the forms, and through them the spirit, of the old religion overpowered for a time its more spiritual rival—than the rise of a vast system of hero worship, interwrought with a mythology as wild and as baseless as that it had displaced—which for centuries misdirected and corrupted the mind of Europe under the name of Christianity. With literal truth we may affirm, that the *Martyria* now took the place of the *Heroa*—the legend, of the ancient myth—the encaustic pannel and mosaic, of the statue and the sculptured frieze.† The Christians of the 4th century looked back

* Such as the *Peristephanon* of Prudentius.

† We were hardly aware of the completeness of this parallel, (at least at so early a period,) till recently, in turning over the pages of Prudentius, we met with the following account of his visiting the grave of the martyr Cassianus, previous to setting out on a journey to Rome (*Peristephanon* XII. *Passio Cassiani*).

Stratus humi tumulo adolvebar, quem sacer ornat
Martyr dicato Cassianus corpore.
Dum lacrymans mecum reputo mea vulnera, et omnes
Vitæ labores ac dolorum acumina,
Erexì ad cælum faciem; stetit obvia contra
Fucus colorum picta imago Martyris,
Plagas mille gerens, totos lacerata per artus,
Ruptam minutis præferens punctis cutem.—5-12.

The Sacristan then steps forward, and in a narrative, half ludicrous, half disgusting, explains the particulars of the martyrdom (a schoolmaster pricked to death by the *styli* of his own scholars, who thus spitefully revenge themselves on the author of their tasks and their castigations).

————— Quod prospicis, hospes,

Non est inanis aut anilis fabula.

Historiam pictura refert.

He recommends the poet to make known his wishes to the Saint.

Suggere, si quod habes, justum vel amabile votum,

Spes si qua tibi est, si quid intus æstuas.

Audit, crede, preces Martyr prosperrimus omnes,

Ratasque reddet quas videt probabiles.—95-99.

The prayers are heard, and the wishes are fulfilled.—Prudentius flourished at the end of the 4th century.

with grateful veneration on the martyrs, as the authors of their prosperous condition, whose zeal and constancy had broken the power of the demons and overturned their altars, and erected on their ruins a new spiritual empire. The martyrs seemed therefore entitled to step into the vacated seat of honour, and to become the objects of a secondary worship. The admiration of their sufferings which had so misled and perverted the religious zeal of their own age, was carried to a still greater height of absurdity, when time, drawing its misty veil over their memory, confused in one undistinguishable mass a solitary fact or a mere name with the cloud-creations of fable. We have sometimes thought we could discern traces of the uneradicated ferocity of the Roman mind, familiar with spectacles of blood, and almost craving the strong excitement they supplied—in the evident satisfaction with which Prudentius and other writers of this period, expatiate on the most horrible details of martyrdom—how the limbs of the sufferer were mangled and torn asunder—and how his friends collected them, and sponged up the scattered blood, and conveyed the sacred remains to their final resting place.* It is the transmigration of Lucan's spirit into a Christian form. The delight in these subjects produced an effect on Christian Art which it never lost, and darkened the bright and cheerful character of its earliest expression with a sterner and sadder hue. In a passage where Gregory of Nyssa minutely describes the circumstances which an artist had skilfully combined, to give vividness and reality to his painting of the last torture of the martyr Theodore, we could almost fancy we were reading an account of some dark and fearful picture from the hand of Caravaggio or Spagnoletto.† There are many proofs from writers of this age, that artistic representations were becoming a constant decoration of the Churches.‡ They were considered as a sort of book that spoke to the eye, capable of acting strongly on the feelings and of communicating

* See the description of the martyrdom of Hippolytus in Prudentius.

† *Oratio de laudib. Theod. Martyr.* c. 2. The whole passage is given in the original by Gieseler, § 97.

‡ They were executed either in Encaustic (in which wax was employed as the colouring vehicle, and applied by means of heat—whence the name) or in Mosaic, which became the predominant style in the Basilicas of Italy, and, for its durability, was encouraged by the Popes.

useful instruction. Gregory of Nyssa alludes to a picture of the sacrifice of Isaac, which he says he could never behold without tears. Gregory Nazianzen mentions a church built by his father, the walls of which, he tells us, were adorned with pictures true to the life; and Paulinus of Nola erected two churches in Italy, which he decorated in the same manner, for the avowed object of drawing away the people from the riot and drunkenness which attended the dedication feasts.* As yet, scenes from the New Testament were not common; and when Christ was introduced, it was either symbolically under the figure of a lamb, or with great solemnity, in his human nature, bestowing the wreath of victory, like a judge in the public games, on a triumphant martyr.† It was the tendency of Art, from the direction thus given to it, to become less symbolical, and more historical—i. e. to confine itself more to representations of human feeling and action, which were assumed as historically true; and this change is one of the signs of a transition from the classical to the medieval period of Art. Nevertheless, the symbolical was still largely retained; and, as in works of heathen art, supplied the subordinate, and sometimes the distinctive, accompaniments of the historical forms, which now began to be fixed in permanent and unchanging types.‡

One consequence of the passion for representing martyrdoms, and, what next ensued, the most marvellous incidents in the history of Christ and his family—has been, that Christian artists, down into modern times, have more usually taken their subjects from legendary and apocryphal sources, than from the New Testament itself. Art,

* See the passages quoted in Münter, pp. 9 & 10.

† He is so represented in a passage of Gregory of Nyssa, already referred to. The writer seems anxious to show, that there was no attempt to exhibit him in his divine character, by expressly using the words, *τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης μορφῆς τὸ ἐκτίπωμα*.

‡ Natural and celestial objects were symbolised by personification. Heaven, for example, was represented by a human figure with a veil expanded by both hands above the head (see a plate in Didron, p. 232). Rivers were expressed in a similar way. These symbolical forms excluded for a long time the landscape, which constitutes so beautiful an element in modern historical pictures. Particular symbols—as the palm, the lily, the lamp, the book—and particular colours, acquired in time a distinctive signification, and were appropriated to certain objects and persons, as indicative of their state and character.—Duran-dus, p. 64, 77, & Appendix E.—Didron, p. 145. See also the curious account by Sir Edmund Head, of a work on Christian Iconography, translated from the Greek, in the Preface to Kugler's Hist. of Painting, Part II., p. xli., note.

in the mediæval as in the classical age, has clothed in a visible shape the ideas of the popular mythology. The one is unintelligible without some knowledge of the other. As the vases and sculptures of the Greeks are interpreted by the fables of their poets; so the works of Christian artists must often remain in impenetrable obscurity, but for the light thrown on them by the Apocrypha and the Legend.*

In the earliest figures of Christ, he is represented as a beardless young man of noble and benignant countenance—rather embodying an ideal conception, than implying a conformity to historical truth—in harmony with the symbolical character and generally classical spirit of the first period of Christian art. Under this form, his mien and appearance almost remind one of the youthful Apollo. But with the increasing tendency towards the historical, and abandonment of the symbolical (by a decree of the Quini-sexstine Council in 692, it was forbidden to represent Christ under the image of a lamb)—another cast of head became predominant, distinguished by the beard, and by features of more earnest and more majestic expression, for which, in the course of the 6th and 7th centuries, extraordinary reverence began to be claimed, not merely as a faithful likeness, but as the production of no human hand.† These feelings contributed to fix a kind of traditional type in the delineation of Christ's features, which has subsisted to the present day, religious awe forbidding any attempt at innovation in what was considered divine. These likenesses, founded on some more ancient type, which may possibly have come through a Gnostic channel from a heathen source—seem to have been first diffused from the convents of Constantinople.‡ The earliest—

* A thoroughly learned and candid work on Christian Mythology, viewed in its connection with the history and development of Christian Art, is yet a desideratum. We have looked for some years with impatience to the fulfilment of Thilo's promise (*Codex Apocryphus, Prolegomen.* p. cxvii.)—'Nos fortasse, si deus vitam dederit otiumque, aliquando partem (artis) historie illustrare studebimus edenda Mythologia Christiana, in qua animus est etiam fabularum artis operibus expressarum originem et ætatem, significationem et connexum, commonstrare.'

† These likenesses were called *ἀχειροποίητοι*—traced back, on one side, to the marvellous story of Abgarus, and on the other, to that of Veronica—and formed the nucleus around which an immense mass of legend accumulated. See Grimm's *Sage vom Ursprung der Christusbilder*.

‡ Neither Eusebius nor Augustine had the slightest notion, that the heads

such as pretend descent from the picture said to have belonged to Abgarus—are marked by a strong Byzantine character. The monastic spirit of their authors will account for the unchanging uniformity of their expression. They resemble, in this respect, all the productions of a religious order, in which the free exercise of individual genius is overborne by the spirit of caste. A head of Christ, deviating in some degree from the Byzantine type, and asserting a derivation from a different original, was at a later period prevalent in the Western Church. Grimm has noticed the chief points of distinction between the Greek and the Latin variety. Both agree in their general tone of expression: and both become sadder and sterner, as they enter deeper into the medieval period.*

Next to the proper deification of Jesus, with a subordinated system of hero worship, the most remarkable feature in the history of Christianity, as we approach the middle ages, is the rise of that extraordinary veneration for the Virgin, which exalted her to a Queen of heaven, and almost eclipsed for a time the worship of the Father and the Son. This extraordinary phenomenon—with a reference to the deep workings of a latent heathenism, out of which it sprang, and to its manifold effects on manners and on art—opens a wide field for various speculation, on which our limits forbid us to enter, beyond this one observation—that, as the worship of the Virgin, in respect to the purer and more spiritual theology which it displaced, was undoubtedly a great corruption, so in respect to the actual mass of religious belief and practice with which it grew up, and of which it formed a part, it had a soft and humanising influence, which it would be

of Christ, which were in circulation in their time, could pretend to be likenesses, grounding their opinion on the conclusive fact, that they were so many and so unlike one another (*innumerabilium cogitationum diversitate*), no one having a better claim than the rest. Several learned men have thought, they could discern a resemblance between the traditional representation of Christ and the heads on some heathen coins, e.g. those of Antoninus Pius and Hadrian, and of Serapis, as already mentioned.

* All the great personages of sacred story, Paul and Peter and John, passed at length into a determinate mode of representation, fixed by certain limits and accompanied by unvarying signs, which made them as immediately recognisable on a first view, as if their names had been written over their heads. This indeed was indispensable to the use of pictures as a medium of popular instruction. See Durandus's directions for the representation of Andrew and Bartholomew, p. 62, Engl. Transl. n. 39.

unjust to overlook and deny. Under the terrors of a theology dark with fear and gloom, in which the mild Jesus himself appears with upraised hand and threatening brow, as *Rex tremendæ majestatis*, the believer fled for relief to the knees of the sweet and gentle Mother of God, imaging in heaven the holiest of human affections, and looking down with an eye of compassionate love on a world of woe. In art, her radiant image tempers the black horrors of martyrdom, and with a severe purity, which no forms of heathen beauty ever expressed, envelops in the mild lustre of feminine tenderness the terrific throne of her son.

It was the deep interest in the Virgin, which gave such prominence in Christian Art to the scenes of the Nativity, and the Annunciation, and the Flight into Egypt. Her immaculate purity also was theologically associated with the efficacy of the redemption achieved by her Son. Art, it may be observed, in consequence of its intimate connection with theology, which it helped to illustrate and interpret—took its favourite subjects from the two ends of the life of Christ:—the events of his birth and his infancy furnished one series; his agony, condemnation, passion, resurrection, and ascension, supplied the other. Here rose up the stupendous facts, on which theology reared its vast overshadowing system of doctrine:—the intervening space, filled with wholesome doctrine and healing miracle, was too smooth and level to ordinary comprehension, and offered too few eminences for reflecting the distant rays of prophecy, to satisfy the demands of an imagination that could only see God in the startling and the strange. Generally, the choice of subjects from the New Testament was determined by their supposed correspondence to certain types in the old; and the two series were linked together for reciprocal illustration with the systematic strictness of a theological treatise. This conception of the mutual relation of the Old Law and the New, modified the development of Sacred Art all through the Middle Ages, and influenced the selection and arrangement of the subjects which adorn the ceiling of the Sistine Chapel and the Loggie of the Vatican.*

* See Kugler's History of Painting, pp. 216, 277, with the notes of the Editor.

The whole of the Medieval period from the 9th to the 15th century, was a period of the most intense activity in Art. Ideas were personified and made visible. The eye was more constantly employed as a vehicle for instruction, than the ear. The ancient dread of idolatry vanished; and step by step, continually translating symbolism into anthropomorphism, Art proceeded with a daring hand to depict under a human form the invisible Father and the ineffable mystery of the Trinity. At the commencement of this remarkable period, there was a last but ineffectual remonstrance of the old monotheistic spiritualism against the tendency that was insidiously working against it, in the outbreak of the Iconoclast movement in the 8th century. It was overpowered by the same secret influence which nourished the tendency itself—the genius of heathen Art, still haunting the shades of the convents, and using its magic spell as a means of spiritual delusion. We must refer our readers to Didron's instructive book, for many curious illustrations of the action and reaction of Art and Theology during the Middle Ages. We have only time for a few general remarks, necessary to complete our very brief and imperfect view of the subject.

The Medieval mind was nourished by theological ideas, and moulded by the priestly power which dispensed all the higher influences of the time. All objects were surveyed from a religious, or, more correctly, from an ecclesiastical, point of view.* The order of our modern philosophy was completely reversed. The world of ideas preceded in importance the world of facts, which was but a mirror to reflect the images of the former. Mysterious personages, whose heads, encircled with the nimbus, proclaimed them as belonging to a higher order of existence†—revealing their awful forms on the frescoed wall and the mosaic of the vaulted roof, or gleaming with a strange and spectral life through the rich grotesqueness of the storied window—spoke silently to the wondering heart and beckoned it away to other scenes. And the presence of these beings was every where interfused with all the objects and interests of

* The Father was sometimes represented in the costume of a Pope, with alb and cope, and a tiara of many crowns. Didron, p. 200.

† The nimbus does not make its appearance in the four first centuries of our era, and finally vanishes out of view at the end of the 16th. Didron, p. 75—83.

man's daily life. Every church that reared its clustering pinnacles and lofty spire in bold and beautiful relief against the evening sky—every convent whose bell of silvery tone announced the hour of appointed prayer—every cross or tabernacled shrine by the way-side—every solitary chapel far up among the hills or embosomed in the forest shade—every well whose pure, cold, wave had a healing power—were memorials of that spiritual hierarchy which kept perpetual watch over earth and shielded it from the assaults of the Evil One. Thus actuality almost vanished from men's serious thoughts. Scripture was allegorised, or its plain narratives turned from their obvious meaning by legendary perversion and addition; while the outward world was changed into a mere symbol, a material veil of deep spiritual readings. The so called science of the time had the same shadowy and unreal character; it dealt with assumptions rather than with facts; and while it perfected the instrument, omitted to collect the material:—so that, to use the language of the learned historian of Christian Philosophy, 'it seemed more the business of Science, to inquire, what a thing symbolically meant, than what it was.*' Yet it was in this all-pervading idealism, that the inspiration of Medieval Art had its source. Men did not copy what they admired, but embodied what they felt and believed. The beings whom they portrayed, and the forms which they expressed, belonged to the mysteries of a higher world, and were objects of their undoubting reverence and faith. Allegory and symbolism, interwoven with the traditional types of historical representation, were the material links by which the ideal world was let down from heaven, and brought into contact with the world of reality.† What Dante was in literature, the great ecclesiastical builders, and Giotto, with the painters of the Campo Santo, were in art: their

* 'Es schien als käme es der Wissenschaft mehr darauf an zu erforschen, was ein Ding bildlich bedeute, als was es sei.'—Geschichte der Christlich. Philos. 2. Th. p. 613.

† *Mens hebes ad verum per materialia surgit,*

Et, demersa prius, hac visa luce, resurgit.

These lines were inscribed by the Abbé Suger, the architect of the church of St. Denys, on the western gate of that edifice, between the sculptures which represented the passion, resurrection and ascension, and those which expressed the last judgment. Didron. *Introd.* p. vii.

creations proclaimed their deep sense of men's relation to the spiritual and eternal, and embodied earnestly and faithfully the convictions of their age.

In the 13th century—if we may take the *Rationale* of Durandus as a fair exposition of its spirit—the symbolism of architecture was reduced to a complete system. The construction of churches and convents was contrived to express the doctrine of the Trinity; and the subordinate parts and accompaniments of the edifice, such as doors, windows, fonts, were made significant of other articles of the Catholic faith.* In the centre, for example, of the great rose of a thousand leaves, which often illuminated the entrance of large Cathedrals, was placed the symbol of deity; while the concentric circles represented the hierarchy of worshipping spirits continually drawing nearer to the fountain of being and glory.† Towards the end of the 12th century, statuary began to be introduced in Churches, and thus a new means of instructing through the eye was afforded.‡ All knowledge was treated in the Middle Ages theologically; and therefore even systems of science might furnish no inappropriate embellishment of an architectural design. The habits of mind engendered by the scholastic exercises of the rising Universities, inspired a taste for systematising the crude and multifarious elements of knowledge, which the medieval period inherited from the wreck of the ancient civilisation. One of the most remarkable works of this kind was the *Speculum Universale* of Vincent de Beauvais, preceptor to the children of St. Louis—which embraced in a classification, Didron says, more logically exact and comprehensive than that of Bacon or the Encyclopedists of the 18th century, the whole field of human ideas—setting out from the primal conception of God and terminating in the consummation of time at the Last Judgment.§ But this vast work was not simply written in a book; it was, if we may use the expression, translated into stone: and its various parts—nature, science, morals, human history—exist to this day, transcribed by the hand

* Durandus, *Introd.* to English Transl. ch. vii. Didron, p. 529.

† Didron, p. 215, who refers to Dante's description, *Paradiso*, c. xxx.

‡ T. Warton's *Essay*, p. 14.

§ See Didron's very interesting account of this work in his *Introduction*, p. x. et seq.

of the sculptor into the solid characters, which adorn with a mimic life the northern and southern entrances of the Cathedral of Chartres.*

The state of Art, though fixed by ecclesiastical tradition within certain typical limits, could not wholly resist external influences, but sympathised in some measure with the changes of manners and the times. Speaking more immediately of the various artistic representations of the persons of the Godhead—Didron observes, that, from the 5th to the 9th century, their style is grave and austere, unrelieved by a smile; from the 9th to the 13th, under the rule of feudalism, the forms are stiff, and the general expression tinged with a certain hardness and audacity; from the 13th to the 16th, with the rise of the *bourgeoisie*, this martial character gives way to a certain air of familiarity and approaches the vulgar,—the ideal, as he expresses it, falling into the real.† German Art more particularly had always a tendency towards the burlesque.‡ Of the head of Christ in particular, Didron remarks, that from the 10th century downwards, the bearded form of it almost entirely superseded the beardless, and that from the 12th—the era when the scholastic theology began to be cultivated—it becomes, especially in scenes of the Passion and the Final Judgment, continually more stern and severe. This awful character adhered to the representations of Christ to the time of the *renaissance*, and is depicted with a terrible power in the celebrated figure which Michael Angelo has introduced into his Last Judgment, borrowed, it is said, from an earlier design by Orcagna in the Campo Santo.§

In the meantime, the breath of freedom and a higher aim began to animate the pale and motionless uniformity of the old ecclesiastical art, in the republican states of

* Didron, p. xv. 'Cette statuaire est donc bien, dans toute l'ampleur du mot, l'image ou le miroir de l'univers.' The four sides of the basement story of the campanile of the Cathedral of Florence were in like manner adorned with frescoes, from designs by Giotto—illustrating the progress of human society from patriarchal to Christian times. See Lord Lindsay, ii. p. 251.

† Didron, p. 210.

‡ Kugler, Part II.

§ See the description of this figure in Didron, p. 243. Kugler, Hist. of Painting, B. v. Ch. ii. § 67. It deserves remark, that the *Crucifix* (not to be confounded with the *Cross*) does not make its appearance among Christian symbols in the Latin Church, till the 8th or 9th century. Thilo, Cod. Apocryph. p. 583, note.—In the East, the first representation of it is said to be found in a Syrian MS. of the date 586. Kinkel.

Italy and the commercial cities of Germany—still, however, within the limits of a deep reverence for the grand outline and hallowed character of traditional forms—the study of nature, and what was yet accessible of the antique, furnishing the means—not of any new creation—but of developing in the highest perfection, that divine idea of which the inspiration was nursed with all the zeal of a true devotion, in the depth of the soul. Those who have studied the works of the oldest masters from Cimabue and Giotto to Perugino, speak of a severe, religious beauty pervading them—the expression of an idea within the mind of the artist—which no skill in drawing, or grace in combination, or magic of colour, could of themselves replace.* The golden period of Christian Art, embracing the three names which universal consent has crowned with the brightest glory—Leonardo da Vinci, Michael Angelo and Raphael—is of brief extent, scarcely exceeding fifty years, from the end of the 15th to the opening of the 16th century. These great artists came forth in the critical interval—separating an age of unquestioning faith from one of high cultivation and intellectual freedom—preserving still unenfeebled the spirit of religious enthusiasm, and at the same time offering it all the appliances of improved science and art, and all the treasures, as yet unrifled, of a whole world of natural beauty—which stimulates genius to its greatest efforts and produces works of the highest order of excellence—where the informing soul and the clothing body—inspiration and technical skill—are in the most perfect harmony. Had they lived earlier, they might have felt an equal intensity of devotion, but would have wanted the same sense of freedom and of power; later, they might have possessed even ampler resources of execution, but the inspiring breath of faith would have been gone.

As it is—in their peculiar sphere—they dwell apart, unrivalled, unapproached; the lovely spirit of Raphael appropriating with the felicitous instinct of genius, the most beautiful element of the old religion, and moulding it into those exquisite forms of feminine tenderness and dignity

* A deep sympathy with the feeling of this early religious school of Art, and a just appreciation of its peculiar character, constitutes one of the excellencies of Lord Lindsay's book.

which speak through the eye to the soul in the Madonnas della Sedia and San Sisto.

The Reformation produced an effect on sacred Art, which nothing could repair. The spell was dissolved, under which genius had securely woven its magic creations; and the reaction in favour of the old faith, was as injurious to Art as the spirit which had caused the schism. The natural life of the old religion was gone; its free and graceful movements had ceased: and Jesuitism vainly attempted to revive a spectral semblance of them, by galvanic action on the nerves and the stimulating applications of mystery and terror. The martyrdoms of the first ages were reproduced in all their hideous repulsiveness. At the suggestion of a Jesuit, a series of martyrdoms under the direction of Gregory XIII. was painted with horrible truthfulness, for the Church of San Stephano Rotundo in Rome.* The division of painters, at the end of the 16th century, into the two Schools of the *Naturalisti* and the Eclectics, is itself a proof, that the inspiration of Art, in its higher sense, had departed. Mere copying of individual nature is not Art; and however great the technical excellence attained by the Caracci and other members of the later school, yet the very principle of Eclecticism excludes the exercise of proper genius, which always possesses a strong individuality—which cannot borrow and select, but must contemplate nature with its own eyes, and express in all its productions, the one great aspect under which nature has a living affinity with its own spiritual being. The three last centuries are admitted to have shown no symptoms of a revival of Sacred Art. The modern religious school of Germany, justly admired for its fine taste and delicate feeling, still wants the vital glow of originality. It is like the after-crop of Greek literature—evincing the highest cultivation, and familiarity with the best models, but shining by a reflected lustre rather than with native light.

If we consider the principles that have operated in the progressive development of the three connected branches of Sacred Art, whose history we have now passed in rapid review before us—we must come to the conclusion, that it is less appropriately called *Christian*, than *Ecclesiastical*,

* Raoul-Rochette, Prem. Mém.

art; and still more, that there is no one period in the course of this development, which we can single out, as peculiarly entitled above the rest to the epithet of Christian. We have seen, that in Architecture, as in Sculpture and Painting, the formative elements and fundamental types were originally heathen, taken up and applied almost unconsciously; and that for four or five centuries, the spirit of classical forms reigned so predominant in all the monuments of the new faith, that the most accomplished of our modern antiquaries* has announced it as the undoubted result of his investigations, that heathen art found its grave in the cemeteries of the Christians. The materials thus inherited, and organised into incipient life, passed into the hands of the hierarchy after the 5th century; and under the influence of the new mythology which replaced the fables of paganism, and blended with the more abstract doctrines of the clergy, assumed by degrees another character, and were moulded into ever changing and continuously developed forms, expressing as they grew, from stage to stage, the inspiring idea of the dominant and all-directing priesthood. As that sacerdotal power worked out its plans and rose to its loftiest pinnacle of secular greatness and splendour, the arts which it cherished, ripened into the highest perfection admissible by the idea inspiring them—first, Architecture—which attained its summit before the 15th century—then Sculpture (though this has occupied a subordinate place in the sacred art of Christianity)—lastly, Painting—which blossomed into its mature beauty on the very eve of the storms which changed the moral condition of Europe.† With the power that nursed, and the faith that inspired, them—these arts faded away; and unless we can bring back that power and that faith, the attempt to revive them in the form in which they once existed, must be hopeless. We may copy; but we cannot renovate.

Nor should this consideration affect us with pain, or make us feel that the world is retrograding. These arts, as they were developed by the medieval priesthood, attained a wonderful perfection, in reference to the end

* Raoul-Rochette.

† The greatest artists, from Niccola Pisano to Michael Angelo, cultivated the three arts conjointly.

which they proposed, and to the idea which actuated them ; —but the end was limited, and the idea confined :—some of the finest elements of the Christian faith, as it was first given to the world in the outgoings of the spirit of Jesus, are excluded by them. They bring the invisible world home to the mind, and make heaven a reality ; they breathe the solemn sense of a divine law ; and inculcate subjection to an authority that does not rely on brute force, but appeals to conscience : and we would thankfully acknowledge the benefit which they have thus conferred on mankind, in effecting the transition from heathenism. But we miss in them that idea of the Infinite, which only the views of modern science can adequately unfold, and still more, that spirit of large and genial humanity which recognises in all rational creatures, under every dispensation, the spiritual Church of God, and looks up to Him, through the mellowing light of these kind and generous affections, as the compassionate and loving Father of the Universe.

We would, therefore, cherish, with the utmost care and tenderness, every beautiful monument of the past which has been preserved to us. Our time-hallowed Cathedrals and Churches, which have grown by length of years into a natural companionship with the everlasting hills and with the dark and dateless yews that shelter their sacred bounds — and which have softened down into the permanent, un-effaceable, features of our European landscape—with every mouldering shrine and sculptured porch they contain, and every work of the limner's hand, that is suspended over their altars or wrought in colours richly dim on their windows—we would guard with jealous watchfulness against the hand of the spoiler, and look upon with grateful and wondering delight—as the records of a spirit now passed away from the earth—expressions of a trust and a hope that once sufficed for the guidance and consolation of a simple-hearted people in this vale of mortality : and where they are still applicable to the highest purposes of man, we would use them, as the first Christians used the symbols of heathenism, without any superstitious scrupulousness—as beautiful forms into which we may put a higher and more spiritual meaning—accepting in place of that perfect accordance with the present and the coming, which they cannot express, the compensatory richness of those tran-

quillising associations which remind us that we have a debt to the past as well as a duty to the future—and rejoicing in the link which thus visibly unites us with the high-souled and the gifted of the generations that are gone.

But where the object is to provide for present wants, or to respond to the feelings of contemporaries, it seems to us preposterous to go back for our inspiration to some idea of a past age, except so far as any portion of it may have survived into, and be now incorporated with, our actual system of living interests. Is it any longer possible to restore the spirit of medieval times? And if it were, would any unprejudiced man of ordinary intelligence desire it? The movements of Roman and Anglo-Catholicism, instinct with an artificial vitality secreted from books and not drawn from the healthful sources of reality, often blind us, we are inclined to think, to the true character of the time in which we live. We overlook the intelligence that flows silently on, and see only the inert mass of superstition that arrests the current with a ceaseless murmuring. The appearance of one such phenomenon as the *Cosmos* of Humboldt above the mental horizon, with the previous changes it implies, and the wondering admiration and sympathy with which it is universally hailed—indicates a condition of the social atmosphere, which must for ever prevent the return of such a composition of the elements as produced the Cathedral of Chartres or the Campo Santo of Pisa.

To rival in other, it may be, in higher, departments of creative energy, the perfection of the master works of antiquity, we must seek an inspiration from the present. We must revert again to the living fountains of Nature. We must open our minds without constraint, or fear, or prejudice, to the influences which surround us; and where we conceive an object that is in harmony with man's highest well-being, apprehend it with distinctness, and feel that it ought to exist—bear upon it with the concentrated force of intelligence and will—of invention and moral power. Wherever we are in earnest, we attain to excellence. An elegant and sensible writer* remarks:—"If it were asked which of the buildings of the present day bid fairest to

* The Rev. J. L. Petit. *Remarks on Church Architecture*, ii. p. 151.

command the admiration of posterity, I should answer, without hesitation, those connected with our railways."—The reason is obvious. They embody the reigning idea of the age—material prosperity. They originate in distinct purpose, and are executed with a hearty zeal. But for the application of Art to the higher needs of the spiritual life, the inspiration of one great, clear, all-absorbing idea is wanting. It cannot settle upon the soul amidst the bickerings of a sectarian theology; it can gather no strength from the petty, aimless researches of a superficial dilettantism; nor ripen into art under the capricious humours and ever-changing fancies of an over-cultivated and effeminate taste. The cure for these evils—undoubtedly a sign of spiritual weakness—must be sought—not in going back—falling again under the influence of priestly ideas and a superstitious symbolism—but in going boldly and resolutely forward—in taking the living idea of Christianity, that highest faith, that widest, purest love, approving itself alike to reason and to conscience—for the governing inspiration of our being—and under its influence, working through a true conviction, discerning the thing that has to be done, and doing it earnestly and well. We must set out from the *idea*; around the idea, once distinctly apprehended, the form will grow of itself. When Christian faith and love again are warm and strong—predominant over material interests and selfish, mercenary passions—and pervade the hearts of multitudes—they will spontaneously, and as clearly as the vision of the future sanctuary filled the rapt soul of the prophet—suggest the idea of a Christian temple at once beautiful and characteristic, fitted to receive into its bosom the overflowings of the public devotion—not a soulless imitation of the structures of a darker age, adapted for spectacle and procession and dramatic effect—but a quiet, cheerful shelter for the soul from the hot dust and glaring sunshine of this working-day world—with its tempered light and graceful simplicity, and harmonising influence, expressing the peace of God and the love of Christ, and the mingling affections of human hearts. Architecture must always retain its place among the highest of material aids to devotion.

Whether the other arts of design can ever be employed again, to the same extent as they have been, in the service

of religion, we doubt. They seem to us to belong to a lower stage of the religious life, when men must be addressed through the eye, and were less capable of sentiment and reflection. Yet we would not wholly exclude them. They might wait in the outer courts, and fill with a material glory the porch of the House of God.—Arts of closer affinity with a refined intelligence can alone henceforth, as we conceive, adequately express the adoration and trust of man. A sisterhood of higher descent and more spiritual function—Music and Poetry—should alone be permitted, as we feel, to enter the most Holy Place, and will alone, as we believe, minister everlastingly at its altar, and on the invisible pinions of their blended harmonies bear up the expectant soul into the presence of the Living God.

ART. II.—MODERN PAINTERS.

1. *Modern Painters*. By a Graduate of Oxford. Vols. 1st and 2nd.

2. *A Handbook of the History of Painting*. By Dr. Franz Rugler. Part 1st, the Italian Schools.

K

FROM the publication of the first volume of the "Oxford Graduate's" work we hope to date the subversion of the shallow and unmeaning style of criticism on the Fine Arts, which has, in our country, so long retarded the progress of the public mind to a more enlightened and vigorous taste. For some time past, evident symptoms have, we think, appeared of a growing weariness with the yearly displays of conventional laudation, ignorantly or capriciously lavished on some favoured few; and no less of an increasing distaste for critical dicta expressive of mere likings or dislikings on the part of the writer, and unsupported by any references to general and well-grounded principles. Not, indeed, that there has been wanting a certain number of readers, perhaps admirers of the emanations of this school, although their admiration was, we imagine, in its general character not unlike that described by Sir Joshua Reynolds as the lot of those who, straining their eyes, in obedience to the dictates of conventional taste, after beauty where none is genuinely discoverable, leave the thankless task, perhaps, with "admiration on their lips," but with "indifference at their hearts." How great or how small soever be the influence exerted by professional critics on the public taste, it is at all times far greater and more apparent in the Arts of Painting and Sculpture than in those of Poetry and Music, and that for reasons founded on the comparative nature and functions of the Arts themselves. To begin with such as arise merely from outward circumstances, we may mention the almost necessary concentration of the *chef-d'œuvres* of the two first in private and public galleries, always few in number, and not always easily accessible for the public; the total absence in our general institutions for scholastic and academical education of any but the most meagre and inefficient instruction in their general æsthetic principles, the obstacles thrown in the way of

historical research by an insufficient selection of examples, illustrative of schools and epochs, and still more by a confused huddling together, in public galleries, of works constructed on principles wholly different, if not diametrically opposed,—all these, we fear, greatly impede the formation of an enlarged love of beauty, and independent judgment; and incline the public mind to acquiesce, without examination, in decisions traditionally handed down, and in dicta rather imbibed, than learned. But in addition to, and above, all these, other causes, intrinsic and inherent in the Arts themselves, tend to make the sway of the critic less imperious and absolute in the domains of Poetry than in those of Painting. We discover these on considering their characteristic modes of expression, and comparative range of subjects. Is there not something in the more direct and spontaneous appealings of the language of words and sounds to the imagination; which rouses our minds to a freer and more habitual exercise of our moral, intellectual, and æsthetic faculties, and preserves alike the Artist and the Public from attaching an exaggerated importance to the purely technical in Poetry?

The long, and generally painful, apprenticeship through which the Painter or the Sculptor must pass, before he learns so much as the rudiments of his profession; in the majority of cases presses heavily on the higher faculties of mind and imagination. However differently this may be at some future time, when a system of artistic education has been devised, better calculated than that now existing to awaken individual genius, and to direct its most ardent efforts to the attainment of the noblest aims; at present it must, we believe, be acknowledged, that the end is too frequently forgotten in the laborious and exclusive pursuit of the means. How necessary, then, now and at all times, that the office of the Critic should be discharged by minds of large intelligence matured by experience, and endowed with the faculties of eye and soul, necessary alike to the genius who creates, and to the interpreter who expounds. We find these high qualities well and eloquently described in an answer recorded as that given by an ancient bard to the question—"What are the essentials of genius?—An eye to see, a heart to feel, and a resolution to follow Nature." It is their pervading pre-

sence in the volumes of the "Oxford Graduate" which renders their appearance an epoch in criticism, and, we think, holds out the prospect of the approaching achievement of higher things in Art for our own time and country.

But although we may now rejoice in the appearance of a mind of this high order, we cannot repress a feeling of wonder at the lateness of its coming. Such explanation as can be had, must be sought for in the existence of deeply-rooted critical prejudices, propagated by the influence and sustained by the authority of great names. We shall the better understand the true nature and import of the revolution which the "Oxford Graduate" aims at effecting, if we consider briefly the character and nature of the critical prepossessions to which we allude. These influences naturally divide themselves into two branches; the one theoretical, the other practical; the former being traceable chiefly to the celebrated "Discourses on the Fine Arts," pronounced by Sir Joshua Reynolds as President of the Royal Academy; the latter to the unreserved admiration hitherto accorded to Claude Lorraine and other landscape painters, who are vaguely included with the great authors of historical and religious Art, under the venerable title of the "Ancient Masters." It is, as a portrait painter, that Sir Joshua Reynolds has won great and enduring fame. But his absorbing devotion to this branch of his profession impaired, we think, such powers as he may have possessed for achieving greater things in the higher spheres of Art, and materially biassed his judgments on the course of study pursued by the great Italian masters in their labours; and no less on that best fitted to guide the student to the highest excellence. This early direction of his studies appears to have encouraged a disposition towards eclecticism in taste. Whether from the original constitution of his mind, or more probably owing to the character and tendencies of the age in which he lived, he does not appear to have been impressed with a very deep or genuine sympathy for the spirit of the great works he contemplated, when a student, in Italy. The powers of "Invention," of "Composition," of disposing "Drapery," and of harmonizing Colours, are the constant themes of Sir Joshua Reynolds' praise; while little notice is taken of

the central Ideas that pervade these great efforts of genius and of religious faith, and were the chief sources of the inspiration which elevated the artist's imagination to the highest conceptions of the Good and Beautiful; whose perfect expression was, in the view of their authors, the scope most worthy of entire devotion; the aim to which all other qualities of Art, whether accessories or essentials, "subservied and ministered." To the mind that applies itself to the contemplation of the individual work of high art, with the desire of apprehending the dominant Idea which presides over its formation and development in the artist's mind, and is unfolded within its single circle, that circle soon expands; the work reveals itself as the expression of tendencies characteristic of the age, of the nation, of the individual author, his beliefs, aims, and efforts; or even of some special phase in the development of his artistic powers. In order adequately to realize to ourselves the full and varied import, even one of single effort, it is requisite that we should examine the component parts, retrace, as far as possible, the steps followed by his mind and hand; and so frame a life-like image of the many energies of mind, out of which the one expression of beauty and of greatness is wrought. Regarded from this, the highest, and, as we think, the most interesting point of view; the essentials of Art, as it addresses itself to mind, heart, and imagination, are brought prominently forward; and the critic, subordinating the accessory and the technical to its nobler perfections, yet duly prizing all in language and form that allies itself with, and subserves to these, assumes his high and rightful position as the Interpreter of Genius. Of such a discipline, hardly the smallest trace appears in the "Discourses." Indeed, their whole tendency is to reduce the exercise of Art to a mere play of the Intellect. His natural genius, and the truer principles he had unconsciously imbibed, preserved Reynolds against the dangers of his theory; his best works in portraiture being in fact quite different from what his written principle would, if carried out, have made them. Yet their insufficiency and pernicious influence may be recognised throughout his feeble efforts in historical and religious art. The theory to which we allude, is briefly contained in his favourite injunction to "*generalize*;" continually impressed on the

student as the surest way to the attainment of the "Grand Style." Strangely at variance as this doctrine is with the practice of the ancient masters, and no less with the views promulgated by the modern sciences of physical and organic nature, concerning the paramount importance of her *characteristic* phenomena, it hardly admits of a doubt that in his view the essence of the Beautiful lay in this one purely metaphysical Abstraction. His work has been the source of the major portion of the so-called "idealizing" views of modern critics. We may observe, that the "Oxford Graduate," in his preface, has preserved and commented on some curious specimens of these dicta, strongly marked by the affectation and levity which have of late become almost as characteristic of this school, as its ignorance and conventionality long have been.

Against these erroneous views he first directs his efforts, ably combating such false and insufficient *interpretations* of the Ideal.

"Is there, then," he says, "no such thing as an elevated Ideal character of Landscape? Undoubtedly; and Sir Joshua Reynolds, with the great master of this character, Nicolo Poussin, present to his thoughts, ought to have arrived at more true conclusions respecting its essence than, as we shall presently see, are deducible from his works. The true ideal of landscape is precisely the same as that of the human form; it is the expression of the specific—not the individual, but the specific—characters of every object in their perfection; there is an ideal form of every herb, flower, and tree: it is that form to which every individual of the species has a tendency to arrive, freed from the influence of accident or disease. Every landscape painter should know the specific characters of every object he has to represent—rock, flower, or cloud; and in his highest ideal works all their distinctions will be perfectly expressed, broadly or delicately, slightly or completely, according to the nature of the subject, and the degree of attention which is to be drawn to the particular object by the part it plays in the composition. Where the sublime is aimed at, such distinctions will be indicated with severe simplicity, as the muscular markings in a colossal statue. Where beauty is the object, they must be expressed with the utmost refinement of which the hand is capable. This may sound like a contradiction of a principle, advanced by the highest authorities; but it is only a contradiction of a particular and most mistaken application of them. Much evil has been done to Art, by the re-

marks of historical painters on landscape. Accustomed, themselves, to treat their back-grounds slightly and boldly, and feeling (though only in consequence of their own deficient powers) that any approach to completeness of detail therein, injures their picture by interfering with its principal subject, they naturally lose sight of the peculiar and intrinsic beauties of things which, to them, are injurious unless subordinate. Hence the frequent advice given by Reynolds and others, to neglect *specific* form in landscape, and treat its materials in large masses, aiming only at general truths,—the flexibility of foliage, but not its kind—the rigidity of rock, but not its mineral character. In the passage most especially bearing on this subject (in the eleventh lecture of Sir J. Reynolds,) we are told that ‘The landscape painter works not for the virtuoso or the naturalist, but for the common observer of life and nature.’ Yet the sculptor is not for this reason permitted to be wanting either in knowledge or expression of anatomical detail; and the more refined that expression can be rendered, the more perfect is his work. That which to the anatomist is the end, is to the sculptor the means. The former desires details for their own sake,—the latter that by means of them he may kindle his work with life, and stamp it with beauty. And so in landscape; botanical or geological details are not to be given as matters of curiosity or subject of search, but as the ultimate elements of every species of expression and order of loveliness.”—Pp. xxxvii.—xxxix. of the Preface to the second edition.

The erroneous principles thus theoretically promulgated have received strong confirmation from the high place which the works of Claude Lorraine have long held in public estimation. Without doubt, this general admiration has never been wholly misplaced, nor long conceded to works devoid of all high excellence. But it has been, we think, somewhat unreflecting and indiscriminate; showing itself so little conversant with the facts and principles of Nature and of true Beauty, as never to have thought of detaching such portions of his works as are true and harmonious, from those which are false and discordant. By so doing, criticism would have aided the student in the difficult process of unravelling these “tangled yarns of good and evil.”

That Claude has frequently rendered the truths of sky and water, and in his best works embodied much that is most attractive and fairest in the beautiful scenery of southern climes; that he has often truly apprehended and

exquisitely pourtrayed the highest and the rarest of Nature's aspects, some few of

"Those looks so like to feeling

Which the great and glorious things of Nature ever wear ;"

will, we suppose, be denied by none ; and certainly is not by the "Oxford Graduate." But it is equally true that Claude has not given the highest interpretation of the actual scenes which he professes to have rendered. At most, he aimed at the exhibition of those calm and sunny aspects of cultivated regions which may be described as "pastoral," or "idyllic." The varied character and impassioned life of solitary Nature were never in his thoughts, and so never found expression on his canvass.

Thus considered, we think it is not difficult to discover a palliation if not a complete justification of many incongruities charged on his works by our author. Weak and inefficient as are his renderings of the individual scenes that lay before him,—discordant and false as the composition of his pictures appears when we compare them with the objects they are *said* to represent ; we do, nevertheless, receive from them a certain unity of impression, not indeed grand or elevating, but calm and pleasing ; sufficiently admirable, as it seems to us, to vindicate his combinations from the charge of being altogether "unnatural and impossible" (p. lvii. Preface). Unfortunately, the admirers of Claude, not content with these praises, have held him up to the imitation of the student, as a master who has achieved the highest excellence in *all* points, and unfolded *every* secret of Nature and of Art ; with a perfection so absolute and unapproachable as to forbid all hope of rivalry. With the intention of destroying such fallacies of blind veneration and hopelessness, the "Oxford Graduate" examines, and severely criticises as follows, some of his most celebrated productions ; among others, that known to the Italians by the name of "Il Mulino."

"This is, I believe, a fair example of what is commonly called an 'ideal' landscape, i. e., a group of the artist's studies from nature, individually spoiled, selected with such opposition of character as may ensure their neutralizing each other's effect, and united with sufficient unnaturalness and violence of association as to ensure their producing a general sensation of the impossible. Let us analyse

the separate subjects a little in this ideal work of Claude's. Perhaps there is no more impressive scene on earth than the solitary extent of the Campagna of Rome under evening light. Let the reader imagine himself for a moment withdrawn from the sounds and motion of the living world, and sent forth alone into this wild and wasted plain. The earth yields and crumbles beneath his foot, tread he never so lightly, for its substance is white, hollow, and carious, like the dusty wreck of the bones of men. The long knotted grass waves and tosses feebly in the evening wind, and the shadows of its motion shake feverishly along the banks of ruin that lift themselves to the sunlight; hillocks of mouldering earth heave around him, as if the dead beneath were struggling in their sleep; scattered blocks of black stone, four-square, remnants of mighty edifices, not one left upon another, lie upon them to keep them down. A dull, purple, poisonous haze stretches level along the desert, veiling its spectral wrecks of massy ruins, on whose rents the red light rests like dying fire on defiled altars. The blue ridge of the Alban mount lifts itself against a solemn space of green, clear, quiet sky. Watch-towers of dark clouds stand steadfastly along the promontories of the Appenines. From the plain to the mountains, the shattered aqueducts, pier beyond pier, melt into the darkness, like shadowy and countless troops of funeral mourners passing from a nation's grave. Let us, with Claude, make a few "ideal" alterations in this landscape. First, we will reduce the multitudinous precipices of the Appenines to four sugar-loaves. Secondly, we will remove the Alban mount, and put a large dust heap in its stead; next we will knock down the greater part of the aqueducts, and leave only an arch or two, that their infinity of length may no longer be painful from its monotony. For the purple mist and declining sun we will substitute a bright blue sky, with round white clouds. Finally, we will get rid of the unpleasant ruins in the foreground, we will plant some handsome trees therein, we will send for some fiddlers, and get up a dance, and a pic-nic party. It will be found throughout the picture that the same species of improvement is made on the materials which Claude had ready to his hand. The descending slopes of the City of Rome, towards the pyramid of Caius Cestius, supply not only lines of the most exquisite beauty and variety, but matter for contemplation—reflection, in every fragment of their buildings. This passage has been idealized by Claude into a set of similar round towers, respecting which no idea can be formed but that they are uninhabitable, and to which no interest can be attached beyond the difficulty of conjecturing what they could have been built for. The ruins of the temple are rendered unimpressive by the juxtaposition of the water-mill, and inexplicable by the introduction of the Roman soldiers. The glide

of the muddy streams of the melancholy Tiber and Anio throughout the Campagna is impressive in itself, but altogether ceases to be so when we disturb their stillness of motion by a weir, adorn their neglected flow with a handsome bridge, and cover their neglected surface with punts, nets, and fishermen. It cannot, I think, be expected, that landscapes like this should have any effect on the human heart, except to harden or to degrade it, to lead it from the love of what is simple, earnest and pure, to what is as sophisticated and corrupt in arrangement, as erring and imperfect in detail. So long as such works are held up for imitation, landscape painting must be a manufacture, its productions must be toys, and its patrons must be children."—(Preface, p. lvii.—lx.

It is impossible for us to enter into a detailed examination of the numerous principles and illustrations which are unfolded in this first volume. In fact, the major portion of it is devoted to the inculcation of but one highest principle; that we mean which enjoins such a diligent and scientific investigation of Nature and her laws, as will confirm the artist in the belief that "he who walks humbly with her, will seldom be in danger of losing sight of Art," and kindle in his mind the desire to "render to the world that *purity of impression* which can alone render the result of art an instrument of good, or its labour deserving of gratitude." Whatever may be the correctness of the "Oxford Graduate's" judgments on some of Mr. Turner's works, we know that these decisions result from a patient examination and ardent love of their great prototype; and this habitual reference to the authority of *Nature* as supreme, and that from which there is no appeal, by arousing in other minds a spirit of free and unbiassed inquiry, is the surest guarantee for the ultimate rectification of any such erroneous estimates of these or other works.

As he observes; those among his opponents who once contested Mr. Turner's claim to be considered a great artist, on the ground that his pictures were "not like nature," have now abandoned this ground, and taken refuge in a general denunciation of the "natural style." Is it then a necessary consequence, that because it behoves every Artist truly to apprehend the facts that Nature and humanity present to his view, that this apprehension must be indiscriminate, merely imitative, un-ideal, in short, all that in *common parlance* is called *natural* in art? In-

deed, if eyesight were identical with insight; if, because genius may not descend to copy, it can therefore dispense with all knowledge of the objects it deals with,—we might, in that case, attach some importance to the remark of an anonymous critic, “If people want to see Nature, let them go and look at herself.”—Preface, p. lxix. Nature remains one and the same through ages; her beauty and her greatness unchanged, while men’s conceptions of her presence and attributes have varied from age to age with the mutations of religious spirit, scientific insight, and imaginative genius; whose power, having once wrought in the artist’s mind, and enlightened his eye, still continues for us, written in the monuments that exhibit the very “form and pressure” of his genius. This critic’s invitation to “people,” is indeed sufficiently wide and comprehensive. We may, at pleasure, suppose it addressed to “people” differing in character and language, in culture and customs; to races removed from each other by position, and still more by character; to some whose modes of “seeing Nature” evince the highest capacities for moral and intellectual greatness; or again, to others whose eyesight is of a range so limited as may raise doubts of their capacity to “see Nature” truly in any shape. All may answer to it, in the various language of Art and Poetry; yet none alike. We think, that even a slight observation of the *different solutions* which have, in fact, been given in the course of the world’s history, to this problem of “seeing Nature,” may satisfy us, that while the facts apprehended have varied in depth, variety, and importance, with the native genius and intellectual power of the artist, under no circumstances whatever have an intelligent and reverential study of Nature’s works been successfully dispensed with. The contempt of mere Nature, expressed in the language we have quoted, and the slighting comment on its relation to Art, seem strange in a country whose people have ever been distinguished for a fine and true love of natural scenery, and which numbers among its greatest Poets, artists such as Shakspeare and Chaucer; whose genius was equally conspicuous for a nice and delicate appreciation of facts, as for the artistic power of selection that brings these into harmony with the ideal sympathies they are intended to illustrate. Such views,

however, seem not at variance with the general tendency of the so-called idealizing doctrines to which we have already alluded. Certainly, it may well be conceded, that even in landscape painting, the chief aim of a good Artist is to seize *such aspects* of the physical nature that lies around him, as will appeal most strongly to the imagination of men, and touch their sympathies most deeply. Art is not Science, or pure *intellectual* insight: but she avails herself of the resources these richly afford for the realization of her peculiar aims. Abandoning this path, the Artist sinks into the artisan; and the Painter no longer asserting his claim to consideration, as one who thinks poetically in the language of form and colour, can be ranked little higher than as an elaborate sign-painter. But where, we may ask, can the modern artist look for examples of that ideal beauty in Landscape-painting, which the criticism of the "Oxford Graduate" refuses to acknowledge, as given in the works of Claude and Gaspar Poussin? Chiefly, we think, in the noble back-grounds that adorn so many of the *chef d'œuvres* of the great masters in religious and historical art. Those in our National Gallery, from the hands of Titian, Nicholas Poussin, Rubens, and Domenichino, are specimens, perhaps, as fine as any to be seen out of Italy. The scenery of these noble pictures, *truthful, yet altogether imaginative and ideal*, blends admirably with the human interests which form the dominant feature; and is less commonly noticed than they are only by reason of their perfect harmony with the character of the subject, and their subordination to the general effect. It seems, that the "open secrets" of outward and physical Nature are never so well seized, and so truly interpreted, as where the Artist's intellect and imagination is most deeply conversant with divine thoughts and human sympathies of an elevated order. In connection with these comments on the relation of Nature to Art, we would recal to our readers' recollection the beautiful lines of a great thinker and a fine poet; whose opinion it seems not to have been, that in order "to see Nature" we have only to "go and look at her."

"O lady, we receive but what we give,
And in our life does Nature live;

Ours is her wedding garment, ours her shroud !
 And would we aught behold, of higher worth
 Than that inanimate cold world allowed
 To the poor, loveless, ever-anxious crowd,
 Ah ! from the soul itself must issue forth
 A light, a glory, a fair luminous cloud,
 Enveloping the Earth.—
 And from the soul itself must there be sent
 A sweet and potent voice, of its own birth,
 Of all sweet sounds the life and element."

Dejection, an Ode, by S. T. Coleridge.

The chief aim of our author's first volume, as an exposition of the physical laws that form the groundwork of Beauty and Sublimity, necessarily precluded that systematic exhibition of the ultimate principles of æsthetic science, which was reserved for the subsequent one. Independently of its intrinsic interest, a careful perusal of the former is a fit mental preparation before entering on the new and in many respects admirable analysis of the Imagination and constituents of Beauty contained in the latter; one which, although widely different from the very prevalent view that confuses the "imaginative" with the "imaginary," insists no less on the high Idea of Art, as an exercise of the free and creative powers of Mind.

The tribute of admiration paid by the "Oxford Graduate" to our modern Landscape-painters, as faithful interpreters of Nature, does not proceed from any blindness of partiality, or any incapability of seeing the faults under which they now labour, and of discovering the higher aims which they should endeavour to realize. Of their "lightness and desultoriness of intention," and also of a proneness to "mechanical copyism of unimportant subjects" apparent in their works, he speaks in strong condemnation. He has succeeded well in the difficult task of assigning to each of the principal living artists the place due to his characteristic excellences. We think, that it could hardly have been accomplished with greater judgment and impartiality, and embrace this opportunity to express our sympathy and concurrence in the following noble views; advanced by him in exculpation of any undue partiality for the works of our modern Landscape artists,

on his part, and in behalf of a generous appreciation of "living worth" on ours.

"If, in the application of these principles, in spite of my endeavour to render it impartial, the feeling and fondness which I have for some works of modern art escape me sometimes, where it should not, let it be pardoned, as little more than a fair counterbalance to that peculiar veneration with which the works of the older masters, associated as they have ever been in our ears with the expression of whatever is great or perfect, are usually regarded by the reader. I do not say that this veneration is wrong, nor that we should be less attentive to the repeated words of time; but let us not forget, that if honour be for the dead, gratitude can only be for the living. He who has once stood beside the grave, to look back upon the companionship which has been for ever closed; feeling how impotent *there* are the wild love, or the keen sorrow, to give one instant's pleasure to the pulseless heart, or atone, in the lowest measure, to the departed spirit for the hour of unkindness, will scarcely for the future incur that debt to the heart, which can only be discharged to the dust. But the lesson which men receive as individuals, they do not learn as nations. Again and again they have seen their noblest descend into the grave, and have thought it enough to garland the tombstone when they had not crowned the brow, and to pay the honour to the ashes which they had denied to the spirit. Let it not displease them that they are bidden, amidst the tumult and the dazzle of their busy life, to listen for the few voices, and watch for the few lamps which God has toned and lighted, to charm and to guide them, that they may not learn their sweetness by their silence, nor their light by their decay."—Vol. i. pp. 7, 8.

The interesting "Handbook" of Dr. Kugler has already been before the public for several years, supplying a great want in English literature, and most serviceable to the traveller who visits the favourite land of the Fine Arts. From the nature of its aim, however, as intended at once to exhibit the history of all the principal schools and epochs of Catholic Art in Italy, and to give a catalogue raisonnée of the chief works of its greatest masters, it is, we think, deficient in the fulness of exposition and comment so desirable on a subject, with the scientific and æsthetic principles of which the English public is but little familiar. In estimating the fitness of the work for diffusing a finer taste and more comprehensive knowledge of these subjects, it is necessary to consider the literary character and position of

the German nation, to whom it was originally addressed. The eminent thinkers who in succession, for the space of a century past, have engaged in philosophical discussions, have, almost without exception, extended the range of their contemplations to the Fine Arts, each laying down, for the basis of these, such principles as best accorded with the general character of his speculative system. Notwithstanding the great diversity of opinion necessarily seen in the views of so many individual characters and independent thinkers, there have emerged out of this seeming chaos, a certain number of general and definite æsthetic principles, almost universally acknowledged as the groundwork of a new Science. Very general some of them indeed are; so much so as to render it often difficult to discover the unanimity of thought amidst the diversity of application. One of these Mr. Eastlake notices as the requirement of that "individual character, the moral physiognomy, which, in its sincerity of passion, atones for so many defects;" well remarking, that "the principle to which the present age leans, would include all Art which is remarkable for *spontaneous feeling, and singleness of aim*; and if critics differ, it is only in the predilection for peculiar qualities, for peculiar *kinds* of originality." These abstract researches, having for their object the discovery of the ultimate groundwork of Art in the structure of the human Mind, the investigation of its aim and functions, have given an impulse to historic efforts. In accordance with the admirable organization and division of labour which subsist in the German literary world, we find this constant interchange of thought between the philosophic thinker and the historian; the former suggesting general views in Art, which the latter verifies or modifies in their application to the works of individual masters. The result has been, such views of the gradual development of schools, of their relation to each other, and to the social and religious Life of which they were the reflex and product, as Kugler's ably written "Handbook" presents; brief, systematic, somewhat technical, and presupposing a peculiar sort of mental discipline, which, we think, does not exist to any great degree, except among the literary classes of Germany. Serviceable as this work, even in its present state, is to the traveller desirous of cultivating his mental powers, and

confirming his admiration of the Italian paintings, by an acquaintance with the general principles of Art, its value would be enhanced by a greater expansion and illustration of the more abstract views which are here rather suggested than developed. It might thus become still more acceptable in this country, where we never enjoy and appreciate a general principle, so much as in its application. The editor's preface affords some interesting views of the nature and aims of Art; and those portions especially which relate to the religious, moral, social, and intellectual influences, which, in fact, decided the character of the Catholic Mind, as evinced alike in the Man and in the Artist. In speaking of the "influences of religion, of social and political relations, and of letters," as "*associations* which are in danger at first of superseding the consideration of the Art as such," Mr. Eastlake does not appear to give due weight to these considerations; which, sufficiently important even with regard to technical and extrinsic conditions of paintings, are essential, if we would enter into their spirit, or attain to a comprehension of the ideas they embody, and the characters they represent. Putting special dogmas of the Catholic religion out of the question, and considering its creed merely in the light of a general System of Belief, inculcating views of life; proposing religious and moral aims, and, from its long continuance and prodigious mental ascendancy, forming alike individual and social character;—the correctness of his assertion, "that the difference or abuse of creeds may be said, in most cases, to affect works of Art only in their *extrinsic* condition," may well be questioned. The inferiority in expression of the portraiture of Christ, and that in the great majority even of the best works, is a circumstance which is striking, and, we believe, indisputable. It derives its source, however, from the prevailing modes of conception; which are themselves the result of certain well-known dogmas, that entered into the Catholic interpretation of Christianity. These inculcated the degeneracy and fall of the whole human race, and the subsequent assumption of the human form and frailties by a divine person; with the view of accomplishing, by such humiliation, its final restoration to the Divine favour. This miracle of reconciliation forms a principal feature in the Catholic system, modified, however,

by the rude and imaginative character of the people with whom it first gained ground. The uncultivated mind of these early periods, greatly leaning in its views of human nature to its physical rather than to its mental and spiritual aspects, regarded more the sufferings endured, than the inborn greatness by which this divine person triumphed over these, or the grand aims that inspired his actions, and sustained his energies. Here, as always, we may observe the strongest affinity between the prevailing conceptions of Christ, and the moral and intellectual state of the society in which they originated. The struggling and suffering condition of Christianity itself, in the ages of its first promulgation, is touchingly expressed by their image of its Divine Founder. "He was rejected and despised of men." The thought was one of consolation to the Christian disciple; it formed a strong and true link of sympathy, inspiring courage and sustaining hope. It would have been strange indeed if this earliest idea of the Christian mind had not clung to it in all succeeding times.

These conceptions, to which we are indebted for some of the finest strains of ecclesiastical music, were far from being equally favourable to the progress of Painting and Sculpture. Of a nature not uncongenial to the doctrines and practices of oriental asceticism, they imparted intensity and graphic force to the artist's imagination; but the noble and ideal character which belongs to the highest range of Art, does not appear in the emaciated, contracted, uninspired countenances which we meet so constantly in the earlier stages of these Arts. These, interesting and important when viewed as historical illustrations, deservedly occupy a large place in the researches of modern critics; who, however, not content with pointing attention to the intensity of feeling and simplicity of aim which constitute their real titles of merit, seem disposed to regard them as marking the highest point of ideal perfection attainable by art; considering subsequent works imperfect in proportion as they recede from these primitive models, and exchange their uniformity and stiffness for life, animation, and nature. It is of great importance, not only with respect to criticism, but to the prospects of modern Art, that these productions should be rated at a value no higher than their intrinsic merit warrants. Undue admiration

diverts the attention from the really great qualities of the later and more perfect schools; whose founders, living in a more advanced state of *society*, saw around them forms, models, and countenances, more in accordance with the higher ideas of religion, and wider views of life, which they sought to embody in their works. It is in the delineation of beings, raised by their supernatural character and position above the trials and frailties of earthly life; and of those endowed with attributes so high and noble as, according to the view of those times, might justify the faith that they had received a supernatural mission to be performed on earth, that we must especially seek the greatness of Catholic Art. These we find in the highest perfection in the works of the great Roman, Florentine, and Venetian schools, where the ideal phase of Catholic Art appears in the zenith of its glory.

Having remarked some imperfect, but characteristic, conceptions common to this Religion and its Art, we may now mention, as an example of subjects treated with high intelligence and artistic excellence, the Madonna, a character which, in the hands of Raphael and Titian, became a noble impersonation of the simplest and most touching traits of religious trust and maternal affection. While differing from Mr. Eastlake, as to the historic importance and social influence of creeds, we are far from denying the truth of his observation, that "these subjects are often the vehicles of feelings to which all classes of Christians are more or less alive." The position of these artists is, in this respect, the same as that of Homer, Dante, Shakspeare, Milton; men whose intellect and character were, in great measure, cast in the mould of their age, receiving from it the *colouring* of place and nation, of cotemporary thought and religion; but "bodying forth" these in "shapes unknown," of such high and *universal* greatness as it belongs only to individual genius to conceive and realize. Their works could have *arisen* only in those very times, and amidst those very influences; but their universality and greatness appear in this; that they are listened to with ever increasing reverence, as the sphere of intelligence widens, and society, abandoning her former position, advances to new and higher stages of progress.

We cannot do more, at present, than speak in general

terms of the "Oxford Graduate's" second volume. The interesting criticism he gives of the work of Tintoret, and other masters, are deserving of great though not unqualified praise; being, as we think, not unfrequently exaggerated, and strongly marked by the author's partialities for particular subjects and styles of art. In these, especially as they relate to the older masters, we cannot participate. Indeed, the enthusiastic and impassioned tone in which these criticisms are written, contrasts strangely with the quiet, almost austere, character of the originals. While joining with him in the wish, that a genuine love of Art and intelligence of its lofty aims may be diffused throughout society; we certainly differ widely from some views put forward in this volume, in answer to the question of what these aims are. His admiration so constantly and sincerely expressed for the "intense and glowing" minds of the Past, would meet with our more entire sympathy were it less frequently mingled with a contempt for the aims, character, and tendencies of the Present. These characteristics of our author's mind mark themselves, in a style habitually vehement rather than vigorous, more conspicuous for an accumulation of epithets and emotions than for lucid statement or intellectual repose, poetical, but bordering on that species of Poetry which a witty Poet has called "prose run mad." We mention these as general, not as universal characteristics of the work; which, indeed, contains within itself convincing proofs of its author's ability to remove these defects in his mode of thinking and writing. The perusal of this book, if as careful as that to which its originality entitles it, explains, if it does not always justify, much that seems peculiar and extravagant; and, in any case, must impress the mind of the attentive and intelligent reader with admiration and gratitude for the services rendered by it to the cause of enlarged taste and the Fine Arts.

ART. III. — CHARACTERISTICS OF MEN OF GENIUS.

Characteristics of Men of Genius; a Series of Biographical, Historical, and Critical Essays, selected, by permission, chiefly from the North American Review. 2 vols. Chapman : London.

THESE volumes, as their title-page sets forth, are selections from American Periodical Literature; and, from the miscellaneous nature of their contents, we must be satisfied to recommend them, without attempting to review them. Including some of the most remarkable names in the Church, in Poetry, in Art, and in the State; touching some of the most notable points in the world's History from the eleventh to the nineteenth century, from Hildebrand to Wordsworth; and giving the lives, characters, and works, with pen and sword, of sixteen men of genius, with an elaborate article on *all* the Poets of Germany from the beginning of time,—to deal with such a work baffles the critic's art by its variety and complexity, almost as much as competent judgment upon its contents transcends the resources of his knowledge. Every one of the characters embraced would require a distinct study, with a vast amount of reading, to qualify us to review the North American Reviewers. Neither can we treat the work subjectively, with reference to the mind of its author, for the authorship is as miscellaneous as the contents. We must content ourselves, then, with saying that these volumes will be found agreeable, instructive, and suggestive reading. They are earnest and thoughtful, written, with a strong purpose, out of a full heart and an ample store of knowledge. Never losing sight of the highest ends which Genius should serve, they are unusually free from one of the prevailing faults of American literature, a certain ambition both of matter and style. It is clear enough that Macaulay's Articles in the Edinburgh are the model on which many of these papers were written, but they have rather suggested a legitimate emulation, by giving the example of graphic review writing, than furnished a copy to be closely imitated. Upon the whole there is greater earnestness, more of closeness to their subject, and, we should

think, more of a special preparation for their task in these Trans-Atlantic reviewers, than always characterizes the class at home.

The 'Men of Genius' are distributed into four classes, Ecclesiastics, Poets, Artists, and Statesmen. The characters reviewed under the head of Religion are Gregory the Seventh, Ignatius Loyola, and Pascal, rather a meagre selection, and all from one church. As a specimen of the clear and pleasant style of these Essays, we give the account of Hildebrand's election to the pontificate.

"The pope was dead ; the good, almost great, Alexander had gone to render his account. From mouth to mouth on that March morning, the news spread through Rome ; and every street-group buzzed with praises of the lost pontiff. The artizan had lost a patron, the poor widow a supporter, the scholar a generous friend, the churchman a model of piety : when would Rome see his like again ! 'And who shall succeed our most excellent Alexander ? Hildebrand knows ; Hildebrand will choose ; we may trust the Chancellor ; he will arrange it for us ; has he not done so since the time of meek old Bruno ?' All eyes turn to Hildebrand. The wise, cold, calm archdeacon—cold and calm like Hecla in repose—ordered a fast of three days. Meantime, the last honours should be paid to the body wherein once dwelt Anselm of Lucca, Alexander the Second. Cardinals and bishops, abbots and deacons, priests and monks, in long-drawn, solemn, files, enter St. Peter's Church ; the heavy, wavering crowd sways this way and that, striving to open and admit the sacred throng. Slowly the throng passes in, Hildebrand in the midst of them. Murmurs run through the crowd—'Let us name our bishop ;' 'Choose Hildebrand for our Shepherd.' 'Yes, name him,—the archdeacon,—St. Peter wishes to have him for a successor.' In ever louder murmurs, the inarticulate bass of a thousand voices swells towards clear, individual, utterance, when Hildebrand springs to the pulpit. The murmurs die away : he bids them to be calm as he is, and to abandon all thought of him as the successor of their sainted father, whose burial they were to celebrate. But the ground-swell of popular feeling is not to be calmed, and the deep ocean tones begin again. A Cardinal rises : 'Brethren, this is the man ; from the time of Sainted Leo, he has guided and defended us : no one can be found so fit to rule ; and in unison with your wish clearly expressed, we cardinals and bishops, with one voice choose Hildebrand the archdeacon for our lord and pope.' The multitude reply, 'Amen.' And now bring forth the robes and sacred crown, clothe him, and as Gregory the Seventh, salute him head of Christendom.

"For long years had Hildebrand looked forward to that day, and yet he shook and trembled when it came. Was he a coward, then,—willing to fight from behind popes' backs, but fearful of being in the front? Surely his own pontificate disproves that suspicion. Was he truly modest, and afraid of his own power and goodness? Few recorded lives show more of self-reliance and dauntless pride. Did he doubt whether the hour had come for the blow to be struck which he had so long meditated? Or did he tremble with excitement? Or was his conduct all hypocrisy? Whatever the motive may have been, he shrank, as we have said, when the power was pressed upon him. Trembling, he ascended the steps of the pontifical throne; mildly and peaceably he asked the approval of the German prince, as was proper by the Canons of 1059; with real or assumed humility, he declared his wish to be free from the cares and burdens of the papacy. But when once seated firmly, and beyond cavil made the spiritual ruler of Christ's Church, all trembling ceased, and the most fearful outbreaks of popular or regal displeasure could not move his fixed purpose. He had planted himself on eternal truth, and the wind and the rain might beat upon, but they could never stir him. He ascended the throne; European unity began again, and the sundered nations were reunited by a new idea."—Vol. i. p. 26.

The Poets, the characteristics of whose genius these volumes attempt to determine, are Dante, Petrarch, Milton, Shelley, Byron, Goëthe, Scott and Wordsworth. The notices of all these Poets are marked by a fulness of knowledge; and in the true spirit of criticism aim at penetrating to the individual springs of thought and feeling out of which the living conceptions arose. They are earnest and successful efforts to create a real appreciation of the genius of their subjects. We select some just and fine remarks on the character of Milton, in whom the Man was the Poet.

"It is the prerogative of this great man to stand at this hour foremost of all men in literary history, and so (shall we not say?) of all men, in the power *to inspire*. Virtue goes out of him into others.—As a Poet, Shakspeare undoubtedly transcends, and far surpasses him in his popularity with foreign nations; but Shakspeare is a voice merely; who and what he was that sang, that sings, we know not. Milton stands erect, commanding, still visible as a man among men, and reads the laws of the moral sentiment to the new born race. There is something pleasing in the affection with which we can regard a man who died a hundred and eighty years ago in the other hemisphere, who, in respect to personal relations, is to us

as the wind, yet by an influence purely spiritual makes us jealous for his fame as that of a near friend. He is identified in the mind with all select and holy images, with the supreme interests of the human race. If hereby we attain any more precision, we proceed to say, that we think no man in these later ages, and few men ever, possessed so great a conception of the manly character. Better than any other he has discharged the office of every great man, namely, to raise the idea of Man in the minds of his contemporaries and of posterity,—to draw after nature a life of man; exhibiting such a composition of grace, of strength, and of virtue, as poet had not described nor hero lived. Human nature in these ages is indebted to him for its best portrait. Many philosophers in England, France, and Germany, have formally dedicated their study to this problem; and we think it impossible to recal one in those countries who communicates the same vibration of hope, of self-reverence, of piety, of delight in beauty, which the name of Milton awakens. Lord Bacon, who has written much and with prodigious ability on this science, shrinks and falters before the absolute and uncourtly Puritan. Bacon's Essays are the portrait of an ambitious and profound calculator, a great man of the vulgar sort. Of the upper world of man's being they speak few and faint words. The man of Locke is virtuous without enthusiasm, and intelligent without poetry. Addison, Pope, Hume, and Johnson, students, with very unlike temper and success, of the same subject, cannot, taken together, make any pretension to the amount or the quality of Milton's inspirations. The man of Lord Chesterfield is unworthy to touch his garment's hem. Franklin's man is a frugal, inoffensive, thrifty citizen, but savours of nothing heroic. The genius of France has not, even in her best days, yet culminated in any one head, not in Rousseau, not in Pascal, not in Fenelon,—into such perception of all the attributes of humanity, as to entitle it to any rivalry in these lists. In Germany, the greatest writers are still too recent to institute a comparison; and yet we are tempted to say, that art and not life seems to be the end of their effort. But the idea of a purer existence than any he saw around him, to be realised in the life and conversation of men, inspired every act and every writing of John Milton. He defined the object of education to be, 'to fit a man to perform justly, skilfully, and magnanimously, all the offices, both private and public, of peace and war.' He declared that 'he who would aspire to write well hereafter in laudable things, ought himself to be a true poem; that is, a composition and pattern of the heart and honorablest things, not presuming to sing high praises of heroic men, or famous cities, unless he have in himself the experience and the practice of all that which is praiseworthy.' Nor is there in literature a more noble outline of a wise external education than that

which he drew up, at the age of thirty-six, in his Letter to Samuel Hartlib. The muscles, the nerves, and the flesh, with which this skeleton is to be filled up and covered, exist in his works, and must be sought there?"—Vol. i. p. 199.

Here is a true word of noble apology for Shelley, nobly spoken.

"So much did Shelley sacrifice for principles—principles, alas, in too many instances unsound and injurious. Still though disapproving these, and deprecating their influence on society, may we not commend the simplicity of heart, and heroism of character, with which he followed to their consequence the principles his judgment approved as just and fit? That the conclusions of a man's intellect should be erroneous, is indeed unfortunate, and generally a matter of blame; but that his heart be single, that his speech be sincere, that his acting be the full expression of his belief, that his force of passion support the unchangeableness of his will, so that its decrees come not short of the certainty of fate, that no soft whisper about forbidden fruit be permitted to foul the ear of his integrity, nor any selfish desire, covertly nestling in his bosom, to steal away the virginal purity of his disinterestedness—this is a matter of approval among all men, and enough to cover no small number of metaphysical sins. We may learn from Shelley other lessons, besides those of warning. And we wish that many a lazy advocate of orthodoxy would take of this unbeliever lessons in impetuosity. We wish that those who in order to be virtuous lack but the courage to be natural, who in order to become saints and heroes even need but to be themselves, who from their youth up have kept all the commandments, save that of not truckling to public opinion, when false and tyrannical, would set themselves free, and public opinion right, by imitating the intrepidity of this 'sickly sentimentalist.' One may learn from Hercules, to beard the Lion; from Napoleon, at Lodi, to charge at the cannon's mouth; from Martin Luther, to throw his inkstand at the Devil; but from Shelley—he may learn, when armed with principles—still more when they are not false ones, to fear not even *public opinion*."—Vol. i. p. 223.

The only Artists characterized in these Essays are Michael Angelo and Canova. The Article on the former is of great value. As a sample, we give a passage exhibiting the self dependence and the moral purity of genius.

"He spoke of external grace as 'the frail and weary weed, in which God dresses the soul that he has called into Time. As from the fire heat cannot be divided, no more can beauty from the eternal.'

He was conscious in his efforts of higher aims than to address the eye. He sought, through the eye, to reach the soul. Therefore as, in the first place, he sought to approach the Beautiful by the study of the True, so he failed not to make the next step of progress, and to seek Beauty in its highest form, that of Goodness. The sublimity of his art is in his life. He did not only build a divine temple, and paint and carve saints and prophets. He lived out the same inspiration. There is no spot upon his fame. The fire and sanctity of his pencil breathe in his words. When he was informed that Paul IV. desired he should paint again the aisle of the Chapel where the Last Judgment was painted, because of the indecorous nudity of the figures, he replied, 'Tell the Pope that this is easily done. Let him reform the world, and he will find the pictures will reform themselves.' He saw clearly that if the corrupt and vulgar eyes, that could see nothing but indecorum in his terrific prophets and angels, could be purified as his own were pure, they would only find occasion for devotion in the same figures. As he refused to undo his own work, Daniel di Volterra was employed to clothe the figures; hence ludicrously called *Il Braghettone*. When the Pope suggested to him, that the Chapel would be enriched, if the figures were ornamented with gold, Michael Angelo replied, 'In those days, gold was not worn; and the characters I have painted were neither rich nor desirous of wealth, but holy men with whom gold was an object of contempt.'" —Vol. ii. p. 150.

The Statesmen whose portraiture is attempted are Machiavelli, Louis the Ninth, and Peter the Great. The Essay on Machiavelli is an elaborate defence of his character and writings. The defence is founded upon the light which his own Correspondence, and the order in which his publications appeared, throw upon his real views.

"One of the most important consequences which result from these discoveries, is the view which they give of the writings of Machiavelli, as a series of connected studies, and of principles progressively formed, illustrated, and corrected. Conjecture and theory concerning the motives which guided him are thus rendered comparatively useless, and the question becomes reduced to a simple examination of the final principles in which all his labours were terminated. The Prince then resumes its place as the earliest and most imperfect result of his studies, while the Discourses and Florentine Histories, in which he has retracted the greater part of what was false in the Prince, become the true standards of his character and of his principles. For, if what has once seemed truth may be rejected by deeper and maturer thought, and the memory be freed

from the stain which the promulgation of error has left behind ; if the mind, when reposing on the higher places of the temple, may look back upon the pathway, which it has trodden in its upward progress, and correct the false and erroneous views which it formed, while its vision was bounded by mists and obscured by darkness, then is it from his ultimate conclusions alone, that the character and principles of a writer should be judged."—Vol. ii. p. 208.

We recommend these Essays as, in all respects, worthy examples of the high purposes of periodical literature, sustained by adequate power.

ART. IV.—THE MINUTES OF THE COMMITTEE
OF COUNCIL FOR 1846.

1. *Minutes of the Committee of Council on Education in August and December 1846.*
2. *National Education, what it is, and what it should be.*
By John Dufton, M.A., Rector of Warehorne, Kent.
3. *The School, in its relations to the State, the Church, and the Congregation.* 1847.

THE best rebuke, it is said, for a handsome woman, who has allowed her features to be distorted with passion, is a looking-glass. The English Nation has had a similar opportunity of self-correction presented to itself in the Minutes, referred to at the head of this article, and has availed itself of it in the manner which is customary, to wit, by an increased intensity of the disagreeable aspect exposed. Never did any document take the public so much at its own word, never did any document exhibit a more profound spirit of accommodation, and a more determined suppression of any independent conviction or theory on the part of the Propounders—never in short did any Measure reflect more accurately the precise state of public opinion than the Minutes of the Committee of Council on Education for the year 1846. The result is, that those of us who can see clearly are much disgusted at this inveterate likeness of our noble selves. The Medusa head has been planted—ay ! on the very Ægis of Minerva—and we are petrified at the sight. It is currently believed that the clever Secretary of the Council-Committee is the Perseus of this enterprize. With great views of empire and of victory he bore off his trophy, and the effect in sad fact has been the same as in the fable, that the hearts of the enemies of Minerva have not been melted like wax but hardened into stone, while the drops of blood, that have fallen in the operation, have produced innumerable serpents—which it is to be feared the Christian Saint Patrick himself will never be able to expel.

Once more we have in England a Heptarchy—but the divisions belong less to the Saxons than to the Goths.

I. There is that part of the Country which demands that the Education of the People shall be claimed as her right, and thoroughly performed as her duty, by the Established Church. II. There is that part which requires that religious instruction shall form no part of the Education given, which must be wholly secular. III. There is that part which requires that religion shall be incorporated with the Education, but that it shall be religion according to the views of the parties supplying the secular instruction. IV. There is that part which requires that the religion thus variously taught shall be within the limits of Protestantism, and that the use of the Common Version of the Bible shall be imperative in all schools receiving grants. V. There is the party that requires that the State shall take the subject entirely into its own hands, re-model and re-arrange all existing institutions, and organize one common universal system. VI. There is that part which requires that the State shall not interfere with voluntary exertions, or touch existing property, but leave the general management, and the rights of property, where they now are, in the hands of the local Trustees, and that assistance only shall be rendered to present and future local efforts. VII. There is that party which, though friendly to education, repudiates assistance from the public revenue, or inspection from the public officer, in any form whatever.

The Framer or Framers of the Minutes of August and December had in full view these differences, all existing last year, though some of them subordinated and some greatly exaggerated since. As the old heptarchy of territory, so the new heptarchy of opinion, was if possible to be moulded into one kingdom. Battle, marriage, and concessions brought into one the first. Reason, conciliation, and politenesses were to bring into one the second. And the analogy will be made good by the event: for it will not be the Northumbria of Independency, but the southern and mid regions of the West Saxons, that will swallow up the rest.

The Minutes on Education have offered a compromise—a thing which it once augured timidity, but now requires courage to propose. For such a compromise as that of the present Minutes is a declaration that the propounders will brave by their own single prowess any enemies that may arise without securing the assistance of one enthusiastic

friend. And after all these efforts to conciliate, the matter is coming to a battle. It could have come to no worse, had a more independent course been followed.

To those of our readers who have gone along with us in our views of this subject—who remember the spirit in which we greeted the Letter of Dr. Hook—and who have read the Article in our last Number—we need not say, that speaking absolutely, the present Measure is little to our taste. We would have had a scheme that would have done honour to the nation, and been a glory to its propounders. We would have had a system which should have brought the benefit of a general education to every man's door; if necessary, absolutely free. We would have followed up, according to the more extended requirements of the nineteenth century, the educational arrangements of the sixteenth. We would have had Free Schools brought, if not into every neighbourhood, at least into every poor and neglected neighbourhood. We would have had good Governmental Normal Schools for the training of Teachers, Examination Boards for testing their qualifications, and granting them certificates. We would have had large airy School-rooms, with play-grounds for the children—decent and sufficient dwelling-houses for their Instructors. We would have had exhibitions to Normal Schools for the most meritorious of the Pupils, stated and ample remuneration for the Teachers. On the question of religious instruction we would have accepted the solution of the Quarterly Reviewer—that *religiousness* should be a prominent aim in all the schools—while dogmatic and doctrinal instruction should be left to the parents and religious instructors of the children themselves. Could there be found a government (as there may yet) bold or strong enough to follow out this conception, twenty years after its realization, we verily believe that there would exist a civilization, a harmony, an intelligence, and a courteousness among our people which at present we regard as only belonging to the City of Plato or of Moore. To this we believe the voluntary principle, admirable as it is in its spirit, to be totally inadequate in power. The time has arrived when the voluntary principle should itself demand the rewards of its own exertion, and having conquered in this field, proceed to others, more overlooked and neglected still, and gain new pioneering

victories there. We do not think the highest Theory of Government to be a perpetual quarrel between rulers and people. With our present constitution and franchise—with a clear, well-defined law of equal educational rights to all parties—with a Minister of Public Instruction responsible to Parliament—with an annual grant, and if requisite an annual discussion in the House of Commons—we would leave large powers of arrangement in Administrative hands; and we look upon the cry of alarm for English liberties, under such a system of instruction, as one of the most peevish and faithless cries that was ever raised—almost sufficient to make liberty itself contemptible. We should expect, as the result of such a system, to see the people taking a far larger, more important and more efficient share in the administration of public affairs than they have ever yet done: and the smallness and insignificance of that share in the past can only be accounted for by the ignorance, which under such a system would be removed. The analogies sought to be established between the concomitants and consequents of an English system such as this, and the concomitants and consequents of the systems of other countries, are deficient in every single feature that can alone constitute a true ground of comparison, or of deduction.

When we descend from the contemplation of so grand and noble a scheme as this, we are almost disgusted at the little effort of the Committee of Council. We feel something of the indignation of Moses as he descended from the Mount, where he had been in communion with the Most High God, and hearing music and dancing in the camp asked Aaron of the cause, who made the blundering apology that the people would have it so, and therefore that he had told them each to bring his bit of gold, which they did, and he casting them into the fire, "there came out *this calf*." We believe the Aarons of the Privy Council Committee are not over-delighted with the result. They are by no means inclined to fall down and worship the calf. They would have preferred themselves the Prophet from the Mount and the Tables of a higher law. But they knew, as they thought, the people, and the people would have it so. The test of legislation now seems to be not what is best to be done, but what is most practicable to do.

Acquiescence was to be obtained, opposition to be neutralized—a measure was to be brought forward of such a character as to prevent any “soft things,” as Lord Morpeth naïvely observed, being said against its propounders. Dissent with mere clamour would be powerful out of doors, and with just cause of complaint would be powerful within. The Church, by mere prescription, independently of every other consideration, had a large permissive and negative power. The opposition of the first, and the veto of the second, were to be alike avoided. The feeble and, as it was intended, inoffensive result is before us. If it deserved little commendation from thorough-going men, it had nothing in it to challenge a new, a sudden, a most bitter and unprovoked hostility. The Minutes of the last year, with all their defects, are clearly a great improvement upon the Minutes of all previous years. The grant hitherto has been a Church grant. Though the British and Foreign School Society, as the representative of Dissent, received as large a portion of the money, annually voted by Parliament, as it would put itself into a capacity to receive, yet that portion was a very small one. The great bulk went into the hands of the Church. They had easy access, through the National Society, to the Treasury doors. The Reports of the Inspectors are so thoroughly Church in spirit and character, that it is only when we come upon the report of the Inspector of Schools connected with the British and Foreign School Society, that we learn that there is such a thing as Dissent, or that the money is public money, and not good Church money voted for good Church purposes. The Inspectors live and breathe uncontrolledly in an atmosphere of Church. They see, and very naturally, nothing else—for scarcely any but Church Schools apply for or receive assistance.

From this state of things the Minutes of 1846 arouse us. They propose further to develope the principle of these grants: not only to assist in the building of schools, but the paying of Masters and the assistance of pupil-teachers and candidates for instruction in the Training Schools. They also good-naturedly propose to teach the arts of cabbage-growing, shoe-making and carpentering, which two last, except in workhouses, prisons, and perhaps ragged schools, we take to be more amiable than wise. We

would have left the shoe-makers to their tutelary saints, the brothers Crispin, who earned their present position as Patrons of the craft by voluntary efforts in shoe-making during that propagandist mission of theirs which ended in martyrdom. This, however, is perhaps all that the Minutes contemplated. The Minutes also propose to take places in the revenue department out of the hands of the County Members who gave them to the children of their voters, and bestow them on some of those well-qualified and well-charactered young men who, having been intended for teachers, were not found in all respects qualified for the work, but might still make most valuable public servants. Another very remarkable feature appeared in the Minutes. Instead of alluding to the British and Foreign School Society as the representative of all the schools not connected with the Church, that might apply for grants, they spoke of "other schools:" and interviews and correspondence with members of the Committee of Education satisfied the Dissenters that the intention was fairly to open out this grant, hitherto nearly confined to the uses of the Church, to the competition of all friends of education, unconnected with the Church, and unconnected it might be also with the British and Foreign School Society. In all this we saw a great improvement upon the old state of things. Every satisfaction that could be demanded was given. Suggestions accepted and considered, and all of a liberalizing tendency. It seemed to us quite clear that the Minutes were propounded in good faith to the Dissenters, and that their objectionable features were not to be traced to their own provisions, so much as to the existence of an established Church in connection with the Government, in accordance with which the provisions had necessarily to be framed. We thought that the Inspection—conducted by Lay officers at least in the Schools of the Dissenters, obnoxious on no known public grounds—would very much improve and raise the character of their schools: while the grants themselves for building and for assisting Masters would add to the number, and greatly increase the efficiency of those schools. Still it was quite clear from the first that the satisfactory working of the Minutes depended on the spirit with which they would be carried out at head-quarters, and we wished the Dissenters

to be fully alive to this fact, and fully determined that the word of promise should not be kept merely to the ear. We wished them to be united in watching over the equal rights and liberties of every class of religionists in the country, and raising their unanimous voice against the first instance of favouritism or injustice. The Minutes sadly wanted codifying. Scattered through half a dozen considerable volumes, simple people were likely to overlook or to be ignorant of them. The Minutes of 1846 were printed and circulated extensively, but the minutes of previous years, which to our recollection would have occupied very little space, were never printed, even as an appendix, with them. And yet the character of the Minutes for 1846 greatly depended upon their connection with those of previous years. For instance, we were early anxious to know whether the restriction of assistance to schools of Dissenters, "except in special cases," through the British and Foreign School Society was to continue. It did not satisfy us that under the old Minutes a few deviations had been made from this rule after much formal correspondence (as in the case of Pilrig in Scotland, not connected with the kirk), especially when we knew of many more applications which had been refused. The matter was to be entirely, fairly, frankly opened, or it was not for us. Assurance after assurance was given that this was the spirit and intention of the Minutes. And such we believed and believe to be the fact. But still the minute of restriction lies uncanceled, and formally "other schools," except they be connected with the British and Foreign, come under the rule of "special cases." This is not what we desire, neither, we believe, is it what was intended. Again, it was asked incredulously, are *all* denominations to be equally helped? In proportion to their efforts, certainly, was the reply. A representative of some portion of the Roman Catholic body in London writes to the Secretary of the Committee on Education to know whether schools connected with the Catholic body can apply for the grant. The reply was, that applications from Catholic or any other schools will be received by the Committee, and entertained or rejected according to the provisions of the Minutes: and it was also expressly declared by the Lord President of the Council, to one of the Deputations, that friends of

education, connected as educationists with no religious body, would be admissible to the benefit of the grant. The measure was thus proved on inquiry to be what on its face it appeared to be, liberal and impartial in its intentions to all—restrictive only in requiring specific religious instruction for the pupil-teachers in Church Schools, general religious instruction satisfactory to the Managers in other schools.

But when the two first acts of the Drama had thus closed, removing from the Dissenters the chief grounds of objection, and checking their fears about the impartial operation of the Measure, the curtain rose upon Conference and the Wesleyans. The Wesleyans would oppose the Measure unless the Catholics were excluded. The reply was, the Catholics shall be excluded. The active Secretary had the right thing for everybody. Exclusion for the Bigot—equal claims for the Liberal. It appeared that the Minute of 1839, requiring the use of the Bible in all schools receiving the grant, was unrepealed, and therefore the Catholic was by no new enactment, but *ipso facto*, excluded: the only Bible known to the Council being the Authorized Version. The Secretary turned the comic side of the mask to the Wesleyans, and hoped that they were satisfied—the tragic side to the Catholic, but in an under tone promised other Minutes removing the restriction.

Now with a full belief that the Minutes are conceived in a fair spirit—with a full faith in the honourable as well as liberal spirit of such members of the Committee as the Marquis of Lansdowne, Lord Morpeth, and indeed the remainder—we do not like this hide-and-seek on the part of their Secretary, nor these trap-doors upon the stage, down which obnoxious matters can be thrown, or up from which they can be brought, according to the exigencies of the case. One of the great recommendations to us of the present Minutes has been their religious tolerance—and the making the Church and the Denominations consenting parties to the toleration of each other. What has shocked the bigot has pleased us—that the recognition of the principle, that though religion was a necessity of man, and indispensable to a sound and complete education, the essence might be contained under different forms, and that Independent, Catholic, Quaker, Unitarian, Wesleyan, Baptist, or he who was not ostensibly connected with any of these,

might yet give a good religious training, to be admitted as such, equally with that given by the Church. The latitudinarianism of the avowal compensated in our minds for some of the restrictions. And this, notwithstanding all manœuvring, we believe to be the spirit of the Measure yet. If it be not, we shall soon know, and then we shall be one step nearer to the kind of education we desire. The conduct indeed of a large number of the Dissenters will have irretrievably weakened the hands of the defenders of equal rights, and we shall have to owe to the justice of the Legislature, what we might once have claimed by the force of character and of argument. For we regard it as perfectly plain that the Dissenters abovenamed have put themselves in the position of obstructives, not to be convinced, but to be over-ridden—as enemies of all National Education, rather than as advocates for the best. The present, as any government, will cling more tenaciously to the Church, to help them to avoid submission to such dictation: and we much more fear that the Measure will be carried out less liberally to please the Church who support it, than more liberally to please the Dissenters who so hopelessly and fanatically abuse it. The orthodox Dissenters have inflicted on themselves and on their influence a deadly wound.

The strongest objection which has been taken to the present Minutes brings the superiority of a good secular to a quasi-religious State education into full prominence—we mean the objection that in Church-schools the pupil-teachers and masters will in the course of their training be subjected to examination in Church Formularies. At first it was ignorantly supposed that such examination would be required from all candidates for teachers' orders (to borrow an ecclesiastical phrase), even though Dissenters. But when everybody knew that this was only a provision for the Church-schools, it was still felt to be unjust and oppressive—unjust, where there was only one school, and that a Church school, to Dissenters; and oppressive even to those young persons who belonged to the Church, but who might not wish thus early to be bound to a species of religious subscription. Now we recognize this evil, but we recognize it as the product not specifically of these Minutes, but of the very existence of a Church establishment, and of the

system on which the Minutes are framed. In these schools, it will not be the State that supplies all the money, but the Church which voluntarily supplies more than two-thirds. They are then mainly Church-schools, supported by the voluntary contributions of the Church, and their supporters may argue, "We surely have as much right to require the presence of the Church Catechism in our schools as Dissenters have to insist upon its absence in their schools, to the support of which we contribute in the same proportion as they do to ours." It is remarkable that the Minutes do not require the Catechism to be taught to the children, though no doubt this will usually be insisted upon by the clergyman. Hardly as this regulation may bear upon the children of Dissenters in neighbourhoods where there are none but Church-schools, we confess that it seems to us to belong to the number of those hardships which are inevitably created by the existence of an Established Church, and to which we as Dissenters have been long accustomed. It is the hardship of temptation. It exists already. At the present moment the masterships of Church-schools are far more numerous and far more amply remunerated, than are masterships in Dissenting-schools: and at this moment a man must be really or professedly a Churchman, to obtain any of them. The Minutes seem to us, if fairly carried out (and it is only on such a supposition that we give them even a modified support), rather to provide a counteractive to this one-sided state of things, and to afford inducements to parties, not connected with the Church of England, to found schools in greater numbers than they have hitherto attempted. But we confess ourselves at a loss to know on what ground the Dissenters could go to the Representatives of the Church with this claim—"We will not teach the Church formularies, which you think essential, in any of our schools, even to boys you yourselves send there; but we trust that you will dispense with them, essential as you deem them, in the case of the boys whom we send to you." In a school wholly supported by the State, the claim of both should be equally attended to, or the claim of both equally refused; but on the principle of the present Minutes, by which more than two-thirds of the expense must be borne by the schools themselves, we do not see precisely how we can require the Church to dispense with the for-

formularies in the case of Dissenters, unless Dissenters are prepared to admit (which of course they cannot do) that in corresponding cases the formularies shall be enforced in the case of the Church-boy. And though it appears to be officially promised that every means in their power will be exerted by the Committee of Council to open those schools receiving grants, which though belonging to the Church are the only schools in the neighbourhood, the success in the Sedburgh case, detailed in one of the volumes of Minutes, is not encouraging. The truth is, the hardship is inherent in the system proposed—and going further back still, inherent in the fact of an Established Church. To submit to the formularies of the Church for the sake of obtaining pupil-teacherships in Church-schools, is the same temptation which exists now in parishes, in Training-schools, and which is notorious in the case of the Universities and Grammar-schools. In short, the Church itself is one gigantic temptation to the people of this country in all professions and all classes of society. And though we would not on that account seek for any addition to the list of its temptations, and would be glad to see not only this, but all its other snares to conscience removed, we do not see how, in the present Minutes, the evil can be avoided. The Minutes offer to add a corresponding temptation to Dissent. Even now the Church-school (and aided by public money unobjected to for 15 years) is often the only school in a neighbourhood, and yet we feel that as long as it is a Church-school, we have no refuge but in the liberality of its managers. We are obliged to receive every relaxation of its restrictions towards Dissenters, not as a right, but as a boon. This ought not indeed to be—but the evil lies deeper than in the School, or in the Minutes.

Were we of the Church we should complain on another ground. We should not like to receive these regulations at the hand of the State, while the religion of the Dissenters is left free. But we imagine the Church to acquiesce in, nay, to seek the State enforcement of these regulations: and, as we belong to the State, and, as the Church and its property belong to us as part of the State, we recognize this power, though we think it used to a wrong end in the present instance. But do not these very considerations drive us back with increased force upon the ground, which we

took in our last Number, that the State has properly nothing to do except with the secular education of the people? For we have been obliged, in the foregoing argument, to speak of children as belonging to Parties, instead of their Parents—as the peculium and property of Church or Dissent, instead of as appertaining to those in whose hands God and Nature have placed them. We ask too much about what the Church may require, or what Dissenters may require, and too little of what the children themselves require, and their Parents may claim. Individual conscience is lost in those unrealizable things, corporate consciences.

To turn for a moment, in conclusion, to the Pamphlet of Mr. Dufton, and to that on "the School," &c., "National Education, what it is, and what it should be," contains melancholy though not unfamiliar illustration of the sad deficiency of education in the rural districts of England, and is a pamphlet particularly worthy of perusal by the clergy of the Church, to whom its arguments are especially addressed. Mr. Dufton distinctly perceives that the present "Scriptural education" is very far from making its recipients intelligently religious: and he advocates a liberal measure of national education in a spirit which does the utmost credit to his own catholicity of feeling. His statements, as well as the long discussions which have taken place on the actual state of education in this country, abundantly confirm the views we have previously given of the extent of the deficiency. Our demand for an average of seven and a half years of education to each child, seems also to be more generally acquiesced in, or at least approached, than at an earlier stage of the discussion. Indeed nothing can show more clearly the false principle on which the advocates of the sufficiency of the voluntary principle have arranged their statistics, than the fact that, with every fresh disclosure of fresh schools not previously taken into the account, they are compelled to change their average, and thus every fact which tells in favour of their theory of the sufficiency of the voluntary principle, tells against the stunted average of education-time, with which they started, and compels them to extend the period.

"The School, in its relations to the State, the Church,

and the Congregation," has been so widely circulated, and is so plain in its tendency, that we have no occasion to dwell long upon it. It is a historical defence of the present Minutes of Council, prepared with great care. It takes especial cognizance of all the causes which have led to the failure of all former schemes and plans, and to the preparation of the present measure. But though it is an historical justification, there is so entire an absence of any other kind of praise bestowed upon the present Minutes, that we cannot help believing that the author would have much preferred a national, and apparently a secular education of the whole people. It evidently proceeds from the same pen with the official letters contained in the volumes of Minutes published during the last several years. It shows the connection of the present Minutes with those of previous years, and points out the modifications which are requisite to place all the Minutes in harmony. In order to effect this, it oddly enough summons those who prefer the spirit of the latter minutes to the spirit of the former, to memorialize the Committee of Council on the alterations they recommend. We do not see why the Committee, which, without Memorial, framed the Minutes of 1846, should not, without Memorial also, place the previous Minutes in harmony with them. Education will be improved and extended by the present arrangements, but in order that the inherent vice of the system may not break out into an evil prominence, the utmost vigilance and resolution must be exercised to keep the balance of sects as nearly equal as may be. Dissenters have, for the moment, lost the power to be efficient in this way, but better counsels and wiser union may restore it to them. Let them act, as they used to act, as combined friends of the liberties of the People, when endangered by encroachments from whatsoever quarter, and not as separate denominational divisions, with all the littlenesses and jealousies of such divisions, and their voice may again be heard.

Since writing the above, we have seen Lord John Russell's exposition of the Minutes in the House of Commons. His remarks confirm the disagreeable fear under which the public has laboured, that he has been a party to the compromise with the Wesleyans, by means of which the Catholics are not to be included within the application of this

measure. We would gladly believe that the Prime Minister of England, and the head of the Liberals of England, had had no hand in this affair. But, unhappily, his own deliberate and now repeated avowal of his knowledge of the position in which the Catholics are placed by the Minutes, removes from us any ground of doubt. It is impossible that the Measure should have been framed in perfect oblivion of the Catholics. Their existence must have been known and remembered. The Minutes then were intended to include or exclude them. If to exclude them, instead of the words "in Church-of-England schools" and "in other schools," why were not inserted the words "in Church-of-England schools," and "Protestant Dissenting schools," or "other schools, excepting those of the Roman Catholics," or, again, a note, signifying that the provisions of the Measure did not apply to Roman Catholics, who would be otherwise provided for? We not only think that this ought to have been done, but we think it *would* have been done, if the Committee of Council really intended that the Catholics should not be included in the benefits of the Measure. We are then compelled to believe that no such exclusion was contemplated, at least by the Lords of the Committee. We believe that the Minute relating to the daily use of the Scriptures would have received a liberal interpretation so as to meet the case of good claims for Catholic schools. And we are, in consequence, most reluctantly and painfully compelled to think that the Minute has had its strictest, nay its straitest interpretation, put upon it for the purpose of disarming a bigoted opposition. Has it, then, indeed come to this, that "the Scriptures" must mean the authorised version, so that the present Greek text (supposing, and no very remote possibility, that there was a class in the school capable of reading Greek), nay, the autographs of St. Paul himself, were they exhumed from some burnt and buried city, would not be "the Scriptures" in comparison with the common English Version! There is one solitary gleam of honour in this business: Lord John chivalrously offers fight when he is stronger, and promises, in the teeth of the Wesleyans, that the suddenly-remembered Catholics shall be provided for at a future period, though cautiously! Our cheeks tingle as we write.

And even as regards Protestants, this Minute, recovered in a happy hour from the archives of the Committee, sets the present Measure in something of a different light. "In other schools," the religious knowledge of the pupil-teacher, &c., was to be certified as satisfactory to the Managers: and the inspector was not permitted to inquire into the state of religious knowledge. Now we have no objection to the use, and the daily use, of the Scriptures in schools: for this does not render their use in all, even the youngest, classes necessary, so as to turn the Bible into a spelling-book—nor does it require even the elder classes to read unsuitable portions. Even Dr. Hook ridicules the study of the Galatians in some of the National Schools. The simpler narrative and didactic matter both of the Old and the New Testament may be made the medium of much valuable instruction, and many serious and improving impressions to the young. Neither have we any objection to the use of the Authorized Version, which as a matter of fact and of choice is adopted in every school, as in every church or chapel, of which we have any knowledge. But the requirement by the Privy Council of the daily use of the authorized version of the Bible is not leaving the religious instruction in the schools to the Managers—it is in fact the prescription at least of a particular vehicle of religious instruction in all the schools, and we certainly do not recognize the right of the State to prescribe even Christianity, in the most general sense of the word, as part of the education of the country; though as a matter of fact and of free preference we should adopt the very means which it suggests. This indeed may be regarded as carrying out the theory of liberty to great lengths: and we should not practically object to availing ourselves of a measure of general advantage, merely because it required the use of what all denominations voluntarily adopt. Still the real though abstract objection adds another to the list of those causes which lead us, notwithstanding Lord John Russell's disapprobation, to a preference for a purely secular education, so far as the State is concerned, as affording the only safe, unobjectionable and definite principle of interference.

The Minutes, however, are to pass the House, and pass it as they stand. The course, therefore, for those who de-

sire improvements in them, to pursue, is forthwith to memorialize the Committee of Privy Council to reconsider some of its positions, and to this in fact they are instigated by the official pamphlet: for example, the Minutes supposed to exclude Roman Catholics; the Minutes restricting the consideration of applications from schools not in connection with the National or the British Society as "special cases;" the Minutes relating to the restriction of grants to teachers brought up in Normal Schools; relating to the requirement of a knowledge of the catechisms in Church-school pupil-teachers who may be Dissenters, &c. In reference to the last, Lord John Russell, in accordance with the statement already made in this article, doubts whether he can imperatively urge the Managers of Church-schools built wholly or chiefly, and supported chiefly, by voluntary contributions from church people, to make arrangements for the omission of what they deem essential for the sake of Dissenting children. This the Committee will suggest and encourage, but they cannot enforce. Our impression is the same now which it was when these Minutes first came out: that everything will depend on the spirit of impartiality with which they are administered. The eyes of all the friends of liberty should be upon them, to make them work with that liberality of which they are capable. But if Dissenters on the contrary employ their time in threatening their members, as though they were rebellious lackies, for not coming round to their views in three months, and thus putting the House upon its mettle; in railing against the injustice of a measure, which their own refusal to use will more than any other cause render unjust, and in proclaiming their antagonism to any public assistance whatever,—then indeed will these Minutes render a great and disproportionate assistance to the Church, and Dissent will live to rue the day, when it listened to the rash and narrow advice, to let the public bounty flow unparticipated into the exclusive channel of Church-of-England voluntarism.

ART. V.—STATE OF PROTESTANTISM IN GERMANY.

*Der Deutsche Protestantismus—seine Vergangenheit und seine heutigen Lebensfragen—im Zusammenhang der gesamten Nation alentwicklung beleuchtet von einem Deutschen Theologen : Frankfurt am Main. Von H. L. Brönnner. 1847.**

WE have often heard it made the subject of comment and wonder that while in Germany the art of Music has found a home, that while no nation has names which may compare with those of Handel, Beethoven, Mozart, Haydn and many others, Painting has found there no corresponding genius and owes to Germany scarcely one of her greatest names. We believe that the reason of this is to be found deeply rooted in the German character, and that it may even serve to illustrate the fortunes of German Religion. Music is simply the immediate expression through the medium of sound of the different tones of feeling of the human mind ; and a great master in the art must possess not simply the necessary quickness of perception in the external organ but also a vivid consciousness of the feelings that he may wish to express. Here it will be observed, the delicacy or perfection requisite is chiefly in the passive or receptive part of perception, a quick and intense consciousness of *subjective* feeling and sensation. In Painting it is far different ; although there also the noblest part of the art is creative, though the painter must often idealise his subject by making it the expression of a feeling of his own, and giving to it a unity of *thought* that outward nature does not present ; yet it is an absolutely necessary element of success that the mind should go *out* of itself and seek the *object* of perception : here it is the active element of perception that must predominate, the mind is concerned not so much with the *subjective* sensation as with the *objective* reality. Now this is the

* German Protestantism,—its past course, and its relation to living interests, —considered in connection with the general national development, by a German Theologian ; Frankfurt. By H. L. Brönnner, 1847.

very element in which relatively to other nations the German character appears to be deficient. We can best illustrate our meaning by a contrast. Germany stands out in extraordinary antithesis to that great nation whose laws she has adopted as the basis of her own. If we know anything of the Roman mind, we know that its genius was manifested in outward life, that it dwelt little on its own mental *states* of affections or desire, but ever concentrated its gaze on the *objects* of pursuit. The German on the contrary stops short generally with the subjective state of mind, and dwells rather on its feelings, emotions and sensations themselves, than on the objects which satisfy or cause them. Hence it is that Rome scarcely produced one original poet, as poetry ever has had its basis in the deep, the infinite, feelings of man, being in fact chiefly the expression of those feelings, while Germany on the other hand has numbered among her children some of the greatest poets in the world : and poets too exactly of this school who are eminently the poets of purely subjective feeling, and colour even their descriptions of nature with the hues of their own thought. Thus it is too that amongst historians who require more particularly the suppression of the subjective element and an identification of the mind with the spirit of the period they chronicle, Rome numbers some of the most splendid names, whilst German professors have made history too much the occasion for imaginative colouring and brilliant invention. Thus while the life of the German nation has chiefly been comprehended in the history of feeling, of intellect and of social life, that of Rome is found in the changing boundaries of foreign dominion, in the march of armies and in the excitement of political strife. And to this difference of national character it is also owing that while the "philosophy of Germany" has become in the minds of many almost the best possible illustration of "indefinite magnitude" that history could afford, the literature of Rome can scarcely produce one author of any pretensions to the name of a philosopher, though the popular philosophic chat of Cicero has gained him in the circle of his admirers that doubtful addition to his fame. And it is evident that this *should* be so ; that a nature intrinsically subjective dwelling on the mental states rather than the *objects* of purpose and desire would

be likely at all events to labour not a little (we say nothing of success) in the abstruse regions of mental science, while the practical nature of the Romans never losing sight of the *end* in view would be little calculated or desirous of meddling with the niceties of impulse, motive and affection. —Thus too it is that in art the Germans had excelled in the subjective art of music alone while the objective spirit of the Romans bequeathed to their descendants some of that power which has immortalised in Painting and Statuary the Italian school. And we believe that it is due to the same cause, that while Rome had a series of orators without doubt unrivalled in the history of any state, (though but broken fragments of their speeches are preserved for our perusal,) the Germans should have distinguished themselves but little as masters of elocution; for we think it has been correctly pointed out that while eloquence consists in an appeal to the feelings and sympathies of *others*, poetry is the soliloquy of *individual* emotion: that consequently eloquence demands the excellence of the *objective* element of perception,—the identification of the speaker with the minds of his audience,—and will not allow of an absorbed isolation within the chains of subjective feeling.* And hence too it is that while the eminence of Rome manifested itself (while it still remained) in a strict outward system of formal morality, in regulating the external *actions* of its subjects; and eventually fell into the extreme of a purely ceremonial religion; it was the glory of Germany to produce the reformers who recalled the conscience of man to a recollection of its personality, who referred the outward act to the *inward motive*, and appealed entirely to the affections which animate, rather than the actions which are simply the result of volition. And it is remarkable that the German reformers in redeeming the world from a religion of ritual observance and a morality of external rules fell into the exactly opposite error from that of the Roman church: Catholicism had contented itself with outward *acts*, as if good actions were always the result of high affections or meritorious effort: Luther, on the contrary,

* Any one who wants confirmation of this distinction between poetry and eloquence would find it in the comparison between the literature of Germany and France. Perhaps no language contains specimens of *eloquence* more brilliant than the French, and yet how *miserably* deficient in anything like true poetry.

threw all external action to the winds, ridiculed the practical epistle of James as an epistle of straw, and recognised in high desires and aspirations the *only* and heavenly origin of moral conduct. Deceived by man's obvious impotence over his own affections, and losing sight of his only instrument of modifying them, free volition, he incautiously fell into the snares laid for him by the calm and frigid intellect of Erasmus, and was involved in the inextricable contradictions resulting from the combination of a theory of the most rigid predestination with his strong moral views of the infinite and everlasting evil of sin. This intense subjectivism of the German mind which we have been attempting to illustrate has tinged the whole intellectual and spiritual history of the protestant churches, and we shall have further occasion to point out how it has given a too purely *moral* rather than *religious* tone to the spirit of its faith.

The author under whose guidance we propose to take a short review of the present state of German protestant religion as well as the causes which have contributed to its formation, while himself deeply impressed with some of the bad consequences of this subjective tendency of German thought and feeling, seems not to have by any means escaped their influence. He belongs to a religious party who, we regret to say, are but little known in England; who while holding firmly by the most orthodox tenets of his church, profoundly convinced of the truth of her doctrines of justification by faith, and of vicarious redemption, still finds in a faith which is elevated far above fear no countenance to the narrow bigotry that shuns inquiry, but on the contrary the most stern injunction to gain his faith by *self*-exertion alone, by anxious and painful examination, disregarding *all* interventions of authority in a matter where he recognizes no right to interfere between the soul and the divine truth which it is labouring at so great a risk to discover. He divides his work into three portions, in the first of which he gives his views of the essential ideas comprehended in the protestantism of the reformation; in the second traces the rise of the modern scepticism in relation to the whole development of the protestant faith, and its connection with the political condition of Germany, and in the third applies the principles and results he has obtained to the solution of her present church difficulties:

amongst these are comprehended a discussion of the principles of the so-called Pietists, of the question of creeds in its fullest extent; of the relation between church and state, of the principles of the Licht-freunde (friends of light), of the inner constitution of the church, of the so-called "Mission of the German Catholics," and of Protestantism as a political principle. With a range of subject so extensive it would of course be impossible to enter fully into the questions that our author comprehends in this earnest yet liberal book, and it will be the less necessary as many of them are continually brought before our readers in the discussion of English questions; we shall attempt therefore to confine ourselves to those portions of his work which, as proceeding from relations more exclusively German, are more likely to be interesting and new. It seems to us that our author has been most successful in the two first portions of his work; while he has been limited to the analysis of historical influences on the spirit of German religion he judges with no less ability than fairness; but in the discussion of the questions which at present agitate the German church, though displaying equal impartiality, his principles often appear to us doubtful and his reasoning unsound. We feel it however no little advantage in following the thread of the development of German protestantism that we are under the guidance of one who is himself deeply imbued with its spirit and has identified himself even with its errors; he lays open to us its defects with greater clearness because he does it unconsciously; not in the spirit of the advocate who has studied his brief and "got up" his case, but of the witness who tells simply and directly all he knows;—and we are not sure that the full meaning and true importance of Luther's reformation would ever be understood by one who had not studied it under the direct influence of that great mind itself (as illustrated by his own letters and journals) or at least under one who had perfectly appropriated the spirit of the reformer, not simply adopting his views but arriving at them through a similar experience of toil and conflict in his mental and moral life. This our author appears to have done; he is deeply penetrated with the moral enthusiasm of the early reformers, and yet has not failed to profit by the progressive spirit of liberality and scientific investigation which has been the growth of the centuries which separate us

from them. The great aim to which he aspires seems to be, that the *essential* faith of the protestant reformers should be reproduced in Germany at the present day, with such changes of form, and liberality of spirit, as the tone of German thought now renders indispensable, and that that faith should rouse again the same moral energy and earnestness with which it inspired the whole mass of the people three centuries ago. It is of course necessary to his purpose to ascertain clearly what that *essential* faith is, and to this question the first part of his book is devoted. We shall attempt to give a short summary of his inquiry and its result.

No confusion is more complete than that existing as to the real share which the German people had in the great reformation on which they pride themselves so deservedly. While they accustom themselves to excuse every national defect by referring to the glory of originating that religious revolt, "while they are too much wont to make up for every minus that appears amongst them by the plus of the Reformation—whilst many amongst them heap upon it the tremendous responsibility of offering a complete equivalent for all faulty phases of their national existence, an indescribable confusion is to be universally found as to the essence and spirit of this greatest deed of the German nation." Common opinion is accustomed to consider the Reformation as an assertion of the principle of the right of self-rule either abstractedly in the human mind, or specially in the church as opposed to her pretended head, in the state as opposed to the church, or in the nation as opposed to foreign power. But in all *these* elements of the reformation Germany was anticipated by other countries, and in them therefore the essence of the Reformation is not to be found. The idea of Church-Independence of papal authority had been agitated and carried out in France at the end of the 14th and during the 15th centuries, before Germany stirred in the matter. The German Hohenstaufen had failed in the struggle to secure to the state an independence of the church, while it became the glory of the Valois that under them France learned to defy the excommunications of Rome. Even the struggle for the acquisition and maintenance of distinct national existence independent of foreign interference, gained pre-eminence in France and Bohemia before it agitated Ger-

many. And if the principle of absolute freedom from authority in matters of belief be made the essence of the reformation, in Italy this liberty had long been prevalent before it was even called for in Germany; and Luther's doctrines would have been a decided retrograde motion from the point which the freedom of Italian thought had already reached. It was not in the assertion of intellectual freedom that the reformation consisted: it was in the assertion of freedom of conscience, of the *strict personality of sin*, and of the moral contradiction involved in allowing the interference of any external power between the sinner and his God. Luther awakened, through his doctrine of justification by faith, a living principle as the basis of man's moral nature, and one which placed all men originally on the same moral level. His reform consisted in creating out of lifeless instruments of hierarchical power, living and independent moral beings; and the love which he aroused for the common people was grounded on the true *moral* estimate of the human character in whatever social or intellectual position it might appear. "And this it was in which lay the distinctive element of the Reformation, as an act of the German spirit; in *this*, the pledge of its permanence, by virtue of which it far outlasted—and, in the extent of its effect, far surpassed—all that had happened in other countries of a similar nature."

The doctrine of justification by faith is then to be taken (as truly pointed out by our author) as the moral element of the Lutheran reform. With a mind enthusiastic, passionate, and impulsive, particularly likely to feel almost an impossibility in resisting the strong tide of affection whether it be of earth or Heaven, it is no wonder that Luther should have seized with eagerness on the Christianity of Paul, where he saw pictured the history of a similar mental conflict that had yielded to the influence of a faith then fresh from the source of its inspiration. It is no wonder that feeling the impotence of volition to resist the continual pressure of impulses so ardent, and yet conscious of the possibility of giving them a *direction* in which they might flow on unchecked, productive only of what was noble and divine; feeling too that this direction *was* given at once to minds like his by a study of the sublime inspiration of the Christian faith, Luther should have generalised from the mode in which his par-

ticular cast of mind was affected by Christianity, and laid it down as a universal condition of the Christian spirit, that it should be acquired not by any useless straining after the vanity of righteous *deeds* which must necessarily follow our Christianized affections (and which in minds like his own he felt it was useless to hope for *except* as the result of good impulses) but by turning the affections of the natural man into those channels, which they would take as a matter of course *if* imbued with true love for Christ's person and attributes, and without which spirit of love he believed that they would not take at all. Feeling, as all must feel, the perfect impotence of our will over our own affections, Luther ascribed to the direct influence of God this purification of *natural* desire and impulse, which could however be vouchsafed only to those who embraced in penitence and trust the faith in the mission and religion of the redeemer.

The doctrine of justification by faith was in short this. It is absurd to talk of good actions, for actions have in themselves no moral character except as the result of motives; we must go back therefore to good motives. Over motives however, which are the feelings, desires, inclinations, man has himself *no* command: the natural man is simply their plaything: to gain the salvation that Christ has offered to all, a firm belief in his mission and religion with a deep acknowledgment of the intrinsic and complete sinfulness of the original nature are the only conditions: these once felt with deep and true conviction, God's holy spirit will do the rest, will sanctify through Christ the naturally downward tendency of his impulses and lead them up to Duty and to Heaven. Hence the act of belief and of penitent recognition of moral *unworthiness* (or sin) is all that is required to gain for the sinner the salvation of the Gospel. But from this demand made on the moral nature of man, the intellectual freedom that has sometimes been elevated into the primary and essential element of the reformation is a legitimate consequence. For as nothing will satisfy this requisition from the sinner but a devout *personal* faith in the religion of Christ, none will answer this purpose but what is the result of a real spiritual struggle to find the true faith; it is not enough to have it calmly poured into the

mind by teachers ; it must be the consequence of *self-examination*, of a self-inducted struggle with the snares of scepticism or false religion : but that this may be possible a free access to the sources of faith must be granted to the mind of the inquirer ; it is but a false tenderness that would spare him the perils and the storms through which alone he can reach the harbour of true Christian faith ; and hence the spirit of free inquiry which the German reformation boasts was not the essential foundation of its claims on the human mind ; it was primarily the result of a moral revolt against a slavery of conscience, not a mere intellectual insurrection against the *authority* of the Church. On this *subservience* of the principle of intellectual freedom to the moral element in the reformation, our author lays great stress, and not, we think, without good reason, as we feel sure he is right in his conviction that it is to the *inversion* of this relation between conscience and reason which has since taken place, that the wild and often aimless vagaries in German theological speculation are to be ascribed. It seems to us deeply true that in the investigation of matters of high religious faith, the mere excursions of intellect alone, the mere calculation of probabilities and possibilities, are absolutely vain and even hurtful. In England too, this cry for perfect freedom of inquiry has been elevated (so far beyond its deserts amongst the more liberal party) into the *one sure* means of arriving at Truth, instead of being regarded (as we consider it) simply as a very subordinate though perhaps necessary condition for success. We quote the concluding passage of this first division of our Author's book, in which the danger that may be apprehended from the divorce of moral aspiration from intellectual freedom is pointed out with great ability and truth.

“ If then the historical character of Protestantism be this, that in *all* relations, and therefore also as a power productive of scientific inquiry, it starts from the solution of *moral* problems, and works from the necessary impulse given it by the search for salvation ; and if therefore any tendency of the mind which is deficient in this moral background is not *essentially* the protestant tendency ; then it follows that Protestantism must lose its essential character so soon as it abandons the guidance of the moral im-

pulses which first produced it. And not only does it give up its essential character, but also the peculiar force with which it before drew into its service the spiritual powers that were not included in its peculiar sphere, and united them with itself in the pursuit of the same ends. When Protestantism appreciates the intellectual element of free inquiry, it appropriates a principle of unceasing criticism: this criticism is, for it, a necessary condition of life; but it finds its requisite counterpoise in those moral motives which withstand any *false* criticism by extorting a recognition of their own (moral) aims. Without this counterpoise it is entirely uncertain in what results this criticism may not lose itself, because the abstract freedom of mere intellectual inquiry recognises no *determinate* ends. If now a formal Rationalism is in itself the foundation of free inquiry, and if a positive result, in whatever form it may clothe itself, is at least the possible termination of the critical labour of the purely intellectual faculties, then it is evident that in a certain sense Rationalism is always impending over Protestantism when Protestantism is associated with the spirit of free inquiry. Protestantism carries in itself (though in quite another sense to that in which its opponents mean) a *tendency* to Rationalism; and this tendency ripens, as soon as it deserts its own complete idea; that is, so soon as that principle of negation, of critical restlessness, which so essentially belongs to its vital spirit is removed from its connection with its essentially moral tone. It is therefore altogether the fault of Protestantism itself, the consequence of a self-caused relaxation in its powerful moral tension, if it become the prey of Rationalism. It can accuse no one so much as itself. But that we live in such a period of self-accusation who could deny?"

It is more than probable that we should agree but little with our author as to the nature of this Rationalism that he thinks so dangerous, into which Protestantism degenerates when it forsakes the guidance of the moral feelings. He would include doubtless all systems within its bounds that did not adopt as their basis his own favourite doctrine of justification by faith. But nevertheless, we agree entirely with the spirit of his words. When we hear the phrase "free inquiry" echoed from mouth to mouth as the talisman to which *alone* we are to be indebted for reaching at last the goal of perfect religious Truth, we cannot but wonder at the credulity which expects to reap from the purely negative permission to go *where we please*, the positive advantage of knowing which way we ought to go. If a person unprovided with any means of ascertaining

directions, were placed in the middle of a common of indefinite extent, with the privilege of starting in which direction he pleased to find his way home, he would have about the same chance of choosing the right direction and keeping in it, that the mere *intellect* would have for fixing on a true religious *faith*, if provided with no instruments except its own purely logical powers. The very meaning of the word faith surely implies something beyond the reach of demonstration, something where logic is out of place and reason unaided is at fault. Could we have *any* positive faith, were it not for our *affections*, were it not that we yield to the disposition they impart to us to attribute to them objects commensurate with their ever-growing capacities and wants? "Faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen,"—we find in our hearts certain forces of affection of infinitely progressive capacity, and by faith we yield to the natural impulse to believe that their tendency is not to end in nothing, but that they have a real career before them of ever greater glory and satisfaction. By an act of faith we rise from the finite perfections we see around us, to a belief in the existence of a being of infinite perfections; and by an act of faith we conclude from the progress of the spirit here in knowledge and virtue, in an eternal hereafter of ever brightening destiny, and ever sublimer power. We believe that the essential distinction between faith and scepticism of spirit is this; that faith surrenders the mind to the beliefs towards which the natural dispositions of affections point (i. e. those dispositions which when judged by conscience and examined by intellect, are found to contain in them nothing logically self-contradictory or morally wrong,) while Scepticism will not yield to the guidance of those affections that it finds implanted in the mind, till it has received an account of their origin and of their purpose, and also some pledge that that purpose will be fulfilled. Our affections *as valued by our conscience* are in truth the guides which we must follow in the determination of our faith, in the choice of our religion; and when the reason attempts to throw off the reins of affection and conscience in what it terms "its impartial estimate of probabilities," then it is that we fear the lapse into a cold and empty rationalism; which, forced perhaps to admit an intelligent cause of the universe, holds up to

us a being of endless powers of contrivance whom no emergency can surprise, and so far benevolent as he can be proved to have caused more happiness than pain to created things, but as to whose other attributes we must either remain in a calm state of philosophical neutrality or receive them on the evidence "that a *rational* mind would attach to the historical arguments for revealed religion," alone. This is the rationalism which is always on the look out for an unhappy article of belief where it can show that "the wish was father to the thought;" and looks on the faith grounded on the consciousness of aspirations and hope, as a pleasing but unphilosophical delusion. We believe that our author is right in attributing to this elevation of reason in matters of faith to the post that should be occupied by the high hopes of devout affection and the stern monitions of conscience, (with intellect as their merely subordinate assistant,) the wide prevalence of a scepticism so truly lamentable as the literature of Germany is daily bringing to light. Free inquiry requisite as it is, *under* the guidance of the moral and spiritual affections, to the discovery of religious truth, can answer no divine end if released from that subjection: the mind that has no deep moral and spiritual *interest*, will make free inquiry nothing but a means to an indifferent conformity to some established formula, or indifferent scepticism as to all established formulas; and the mind that *is* deeply agitated in the depths of its inner soul by the desire of a true divine faith, would shake off the manacles of the most galling spiritual tyranny to seek the rest of a free religious worship. Yet, that such fetters ought not to exist, few now would be inclined to deny; though our author seems indeed to be himself of opinion that to increase the external difficulties attending an expression of new and unripe speculations, would not only promote the cause of Truth by checking the publication of immature thought, but might also by the sacrifice it would require from the advocates of new opinions, test their sincerity and their zeal.

But we must return from this digression to follow our author in his estimate of the social and political causes which have been operating during the last century to modify the state of religious opinion in Germany, and to ameliorate or aggravate the sceptical tendency which has

produced a hollowness so extensive beneath the unity of external profession. A brief notice must suffice. The accession of Frederick II. in 1740 to the throne of Prussia, was an event that had no slight influence on the subsequent development of German thought:—he destroyed the narrow feudal aristocracies which under the appearance of free political institutions concealed in fact forms of the most exclusive oligarchy; and, in introducing a greater unity amongst the distracted states of Germany, and setting the example (which the other states soon followed) of substituting for the lifeless government of a narrow aristocracy, the more powerful though perhaps more dangerous form of an absolute monarchy, he infused a new spirit of vigour into the national life, and laid the foundation of a caste which both for good and ill has had the most powerful effects on the internal as well as political history of German society. This caste was the *ministerial* or *official* caste.

“The form of the state administrations was, at the close of the middle ages, still very simple, and without centralisation, as were the states themselves. The corporations of which the states of that day were composed, for the most part ruled themselves. Yet the councillors and ministers who stood in the immediate service of the princes and filled the highest offices of the state, belonged more frequently to the rank of citizens than to the nobility, who always preferred the military posts. The home of the educated classes was the towns; and since, on account of the highly complicated relations of the kingdom and states, these were indispensable in the service of the princes, the education which the children of these state-officers naturally acquired gave them also a similar preference. This relation remained too for the most part unaltered, when (since the sixteenth century) the sovereignty began to approach even nearer and nearer to absolute independence, and accordingly, the administrators of the sovereign’s rights gained (along with the disproportionately great extension of their class) also a firmer and even corporate constitution, consisting of many steps of gradation; while the introduction of the Roman law required an educated class of judges. But the importance of this official class rose especially when, in the middle of the seventeenth century, the activity of the states began to grow smaller and smaller,—when in the eighteenth century the magnitude of their territories increased, and, as a consequence of the character which the form of government assumed, the police-superintendence of the monarchical state continued to extend itself to other, hitherto unsuperintended, departments of life: also, the continually increasing expense of the wars, with the rising luxury of the courts, led, necessa-

rily to the high importance of a regular and ably-conducted system of state economy. Prussia, which under Frederick the Great, had to support a contest with the half of Europe, and had later to heal the wounds of the seven years' war, was able to do this only by means of a system of administration which, on the one hand, in all its provisions, eked out the deficiencies of material means by spiritual powers, and on the other hand, in the persons of its ministers, was estimated at no low degree of intellectual ability and moral integrity. Thus, at the end of the eighteenth century did the servants of the crown rise into a highly respectable, influential, and preeminently educated class, and became in its rewards, honours, and class-privileges, as universally distinguished, as in its rich and many-sided development it was numerically increased."

Thus it happened that the national literature of Germany has arisen, during the last century, chiefly out of this class of the educated servants of government,

. . . "which the peculiar organism of its political relations had first generated, and in whom the demand of a scientific education, on the one hand, continually roused anew the impulse to mental labour, and on the other, afforded it satisfaction by ensuring it the means of subsistence, without stifling it by opulence and luxury. Thus arose, out of the given relations of the political existence of Germany, its educated Middle Class, in these times the heart and home of its spiritual life."

But this peculiar origin and social position of Germany's middle class, though favourable to the production of a rich and active literature, did not affect it in every respect favourably; so far from it, that it unquestionably instilled a decidedly medicinal flavour into its literature; for the sources of public opinion,—of that public opinion at least which will always be uppermost, namely of the highly educated classes,—were themselves imbued with the spirit of official obedience, as they sprang from the caste of public ministers. The *people*, the lower classes, acquired an artificial position of political non-existence; they had no share in the *state* which began now to be considered *par excellence* as the sum of the official administrators of its powers. Hence it happened that—

"In the deep chasm which now widened more and more between state and people, prince and subject, the official world stood with no little self-importance on the side of the former, from the very minister downwards to the Court Beadle and the stove-heater. Need

one, then, be surprised if the direction which the views of life of the educated classes took, was in conformity with their social position, that is, *abstract*, no longer affected by national history, in many respects irrespective of the wants of the common people, and estranged from its deeper interests and struggles !”

Now it is evident enough to what kind of result a condition of this nature would lead in the churches of the German states. The teachers of religion being universally under officers of the government chosen for their attainments in scientific ethical and theological research, stood originally in no favourable relation to those to whose affections and conscience it was their mission to appeal. Educated for the service of the state, required only to signify a scientific assent to the protestant principles it had embraced, led by their training to foster far more a spirit of intellectual inquiry than of deep moral enthusiasm, brought up indeed in an atmosphere wholly different from that in which the lower classes pined and struggled, and placed in an artificial antithesis to the people as themselves belonging to the state while the mass of their hearers belonged merely to the *objects* of the state, provided for by it but taking no part in it, is it any wonder that the spirit of the established religion gradually “changed the original relation of a church to its *people* into a relation of the church to the *state* (which did not comprehend the people) ?” Thus it happened that the religious wants of the people were no longer answered by the systematic theology of its teachers ; its cry for moral guidance received no reply ; its passionate yearnings after the gleams of a diviner and purer life were answered with the accute exposition of a creed ; and the whole relation between the teachers and the taught became perverted : that relation when truly understood is this, that one deeply animated by the same class of hopes and aspirations, feeling vivid moral and spiritual sympathies with a number of his fellow-worshippers, comes out *from among* them to devote his life to their cultivation and contemplation, that he may again strengthen and purify the faith of his fellow-believers with the results of his maturer meditation, the current of his more disciplined and spiritualized affections. This relation could not here exist in its purest form, because at the very basis there was a defect ; the sympathies of the teacher

were not with the taught; and what was worse, it could not but often happen that the moral spirit of the official theologians was injured by the peculiar circumstances of their education for, and dependence on, the state for the means of their subsistence. That this was too often so, seems to be proved by the remarkable phenomenon peculiar to Germany, that while there is no country where theological opinion has ever embraced a range of actual belief so extensive, the origin of *actual dissent* from the churches supported by the state dates *within the last six years*.

But to return to the history of the church. During the reign of Frederick the Great, the rationalistic spirit of the protestant church grew up to its greatest height: the creeds it retained were no more even intended to limit the views of its clergy; the element of scientific inquiry swallowed up the old moral element of Protestantism; the tolerance of indifference succeeded to the bigotry of faith; the old doctrines of the reformation were exchanged for the cold maxims of a social morality; and the interest, which the cold indifference of the theologians was no longer able to excite, was concentrated on the rich development of literature, which for a time was obliged however ineffectively to supply to the national mind the want of a religion. Klopstock, Lessing, Wieland, Herder, Goethe, Schiller, had to supply the vacant places of the prophets of the age; and those who feel the strong bond of connection between the mission of the poet and the prophet, will at least not deny that the influence of these was one calculated to raise the national mind far above the level where the false prophets of a barren theology had left it faint and cold. Philosophy too assumed a more earnest spirit; and if still uncoloured by the aspirations of affection, assumed at least a tone of serious purpose and stern morality in the severe intellectual analysis and rigid ethical system of Kant. The moral spirit of the critical philosophy as embracing purely the idea of *law* and attempting to guide man altogether through his will, without appealing to his affections, seems to have raised against it in our author's mind the reproach which he expresses by comparing it to the Mosaic dispensation; while the principle of the Lutheran reform, losing sight as it did altogether of this

element, and relying only on the affections of man, is made to correspond to the revelation of Christ. The parallel is, to say the least, imperfect in the latter half; since the gospel certainly cannot be accused of passing over the appeal to the will as owing an implicit obedience to the *law* of duty, even though it contain sufficient appeal to the affections to excuse the one-sided nature of the first protestant reform. But the deep enthusiastic movement of the national mind, which literature and poetry combined with the influence of the philosophy of Moses-Kant (as he is called by our author) was unable to arouse, the appeal to the people of Germany against the ambitious encroachments of Napoleon seems to have effected; and accordingly our author dates from these wars, undertaken in the national defence (*Befreiungskriegen*), a new era of religious life. The moral enthusiasm against the unjust invasion, seems to have roused again the spirit of religious zeal: but unhappily the effect was but temporary; Germany was again doomed to relapse into indifference and hollow profession which once more won way. We need scarcely follow our author though the reasons which he assigns at great length for this relapse. It is well known that the hopes which were so sanguinely entertained by every patriotic German that a radical reform in the constitutions of the different states would follow the conclusion of these wars against the aggression of France, and that a political as well as social life would begin for the German people, proved vain.—The want of faith shown by the different governments was allowed to pass by the too submissive spirit of the people, and all hopes of political freedom sank back in the resumption of the old bureaucratic constitutions. To this deficiency in a sphere of external political activity for the German mind, at a time when he thinks it was ripe for the possession of political power,—to this recoil on the old resource of mental and literary activity alone,—he ascribes in a great measure the relaxation of moral enthusiasm, the fall back into indifference. In his own words, “it is not good when a people that carries in itself all the conditions of a more extensive development is limited to a simply literary existence.” He thinks that the subjective sensitiveness of the Germans, disgusted with the hard objective regularity of constitutions that offer no

room for the play of personal activity in individuals or private bodies,—finding in fact no political life where the natural action of the feelings would have scope,—draws back instinctively into private life, and there endeavours to compensate itself for the hard forms it had to contemplate in political life, by arranging everything according to the purest individual fancy; by ostracising all harsh ceremonies, all that seems firm, unchanged and unchangeable from its social existence, and giving itself up to a soft and childish caprice. Such a feeling as this would obviously be very detrimental to the interest of true religion; and to this, with the other bad effects consequent on confining German freedom to freedom of thought alone, and giving it no play in practical life, the degeneration in their religious condition since 1815 may perhaps be in a great measure attributed. The words of Dr. Arnold are quoted as an implied approval of this view “that the German class of literati place before our eyes examples of a one-sided diligence which overshoots the true mark without genuine universality, without sufficient care to form it into a true, manly, civil, Christian sentiment.”

The limits which confined the activity of Germany to her purely intellectual life had another bad effect on the character of her speculation. In other countries where *practical* relations are the sphere to which the previous immersion in intellectual life serves but as a measure of preparatory education, the weight of a long experience must attach to the leaders of movements in which experience is the absolute condition of ability and success. But in the ideal life of Germany this desideratum (though in truth equally great) is not felt; from the unpractical nature of that life, it leads to no public dangers, prejudice or disgrace, and consequently the unnumbered novelties that have inundated the world of theological speculation have proceeded generally from the unchecked efforts of unripe minds. Anxious for literary distinction, and able to acquire it by a sufficient display of talent even before practice has given any soundness to their powers, the young thinkers of Germany have often engaged in a kind of literary speculation, very little less disgraceful than the more ignoble gaming that seized on mercantile England

with so violent a passion. The peculiar field of German activity has augmented tenfold the temptations of an unprincipled use of mental sharpness to catch the attention and amuse the taste of the public, where no serious conviction, no earnest struggle with difficulty or error, was at the base of the massive productions that were poured upon the world. Distinction in the political life of England cannot (or can very seldom) be so acquired; but Germany has no political life, and the mental one which has absorbed it, does not possess the same checks on immature and trifling minds. To this kind of origin much of the theological literature of the present day of Germany is ascribed by our author. "The apparent labour for Truth is simply a self-service, a spiritual Epicureanism which sets about the most serious matters in the spirit of an amateur, labours at the most holy interests according to the amusement which it promises itself from them, is in fact a play of theoretical spirit conscious of its power." It is in fact the morbid subjectivism of the German intellect; where, freed from moral restraint, the *object* of search, Truth, is lost sight of in the mere conscious trifling with the subjective powers that should never be exercised but in that noble search. To this class of literary adventurers, though without denying them talents of a high order,—to this class of theologians who do not use with the anxious earnestness of an enthusiastic zeal the sword of the spirit, but rather as the fencing weapon of a play-conflict,—our author reckons (with how much justice our readers have themselves had some opportunity of judging) Strauss and Bruno Bauer. To Strauss he allows a real *scientific* interest in his subject, and denies him only the earnest moral ardour which should always direct the scientific powers in the search after religious faith. To Bruno Bauer he seems to deny even this. Amongst those on the other hand who, not theologians by profession, were naturally endowed with an aptitude for *practical* reform, and who, denied this by the artificial state of German institutions, were unnaturally forced on a literary activity, he reckons Ludwig Feuerbach and Arnold Ruge,—those negative philosophers of the people, who, not allowed to exercise themselves in the active sphere of life-reforms, spent their restless and change-loving spirit in the

destruction of the popular faiths. Ludwig Feuerbach thought to free his nation "from the erroneous notion of religion generally!"

"But one of these negative spirits quickly followed the other. Hence Feuerbach had not long come forward, when he found himself, like Strauss, overbidden. Stirner came forward with his book, 'Der Einzige und sein Eigenthum,' called Feuerbach a priest, because he still preaches an idolatry, the love to man. Even this religion must be annihilated by selfishness."

And this religion of selfishness has been lately proclaimed as "the religion of the future," by Frederick Feuerbach, in a pamphlet of the most complete and calmest atheism, entitled, "Die Religion der Zukunft."

The last influence enumerated, as tending to produce the scepticism of the present day, is that of the subjective philosophy of Hegel, which (at least in the form it took amongst its more popular disciples) caricatured even the naturally subjective spirit of the German mind. The attempt to sink all objective reality into the different relations of one and the same spirit to itself, is obviously destructive of all religion.

"If the rationalistic spirit had already cleared away much in the sphere of *positive* Christianity, it had at least left, as a postulate of natural religion, the idea of the unity and personality of the creative cause, untouched. But from this time, for the sake of the divinity of personal existence, the personal existence of divinity was abandoned, and both dissolved in the world-spirit remaining conscious of its own unity, amid the variety of its periodic changes. With the personality of God, human personality was lost also, and *vice versa* with human personality the personality of God."*

* It is singular to see how the true spirit of Lutheran protestantism, while morally shrinking from the subjective philosophy which annihilates religion, is yet itself wholly unable to get over the philosophical difficulty in which Luther himself fell in his controversy with Erasmus: wishing to honour God to the utmost, they ascribe all human goodness to him, consider man as the mere creature of the affections, over which he has no power, but must hope for the influence of divine grace, and then it becomes difficult to them to see what element they have left for human personality; and no wonder. Our author quotes in a note this distinction between the spirit of Catholicism, Rationalism, and Protestantism: "Man is neither clay in the hands of God, by him externally moulded, and so made worthy of the kingdom of Heaven, as Catholicism asserts, nor is he a being of equal rights with, external to, and opposed to God, as Rationalism asserts; but he is spirit of the spirit, and the breath of God, which then comes to itself when it comes to God, and in which God comes to it, in becoming man." Have not at least then the Catholic and Rationalistic views the merit of greater clearness and intelligibility?

In that part of his work which treats of the questions which now agitate the protestant churches of Germany, our author scarcely preserves that fairness along with his natural earnestness, that anxiety to be impartial even where he is most inclined himself to be indignant, that characterises the spirit in which he discusses the history of the past. His treatment especially of the movement of the Saxon and Prussian Lichtfreunde, seems most to deserve this censure; and the irritability which this movement seems to have aroused in him, appears again in his elaborate attempt to answer the principles which Professor Gervinus lays down in his "Mission of the German-Catholics," and his whole treatment of that movement. Indeed, the very strong leaning which our author betrays to the side of the Pietists is everywhere evident; and it is only to be lamented that, in a church where these principles *ought* to be universal, the same earnest conviction does not always accompany the same open profession. Indeed the real moral ardour which, though mingled with much austerity of outward expression and starch formalism of faith, is at the basis of the pietist division of the church; the zeal with which their beneficent activity has stepped in to aid the ignorant and needy when abandoned by the polished indifference of scientific rationalism, must prevent us from regarding with anything but respect, a body of religionists who have rendered themselves unpopular by their somewhat Pharisaic demeanour and narrow reprobation of pursuits that do not bear *directly* on moral or religious ends. But as their views are destitute of any exclusively German characteristics, as similar bodies are very common in our own country,—their chief peculiarity being the intensity with which they dwell on the moral corruption of man,—we must pass on, with the remark that the chapter which our author has devoted to the examination of their principles and errors, has no little interest as showing the logical consistency with which even orthodox principles can be held, and the acuteness with which he deduces from the one-sided nature of their faith the necessary consequences which actually present themselves in the history of their religious life.—Before giving his history of and judgment upon the movements which have lately agitated the church, our author discusses the essential questions which these movements

raise, in order to prepare the way for his decision: these questions are the Creed-question, whether the church should or should not be fettered by the profession of certain formulas of belief, and the question of the connection between Church and State. His examination of these points that have lately roused so much attention amongst ourselves is vigorous and interesting; though, as it appears to us, his fundamental principles are erroneous, and his decisions consequently wrong. We should not touch upon questions so foreign to our present purpose, were it not to point out the peculiarly German elements which have coloured their discussion. The Creed-question is specified by our author as a peculiarly German question.

"Since 1767 there extends a now exactly 80 years' debate on the question of Creeds, through the history of our Theology, without having yet in the least abated. It has been driven through all possible stages amongst us, from an unconditional to a conditional obligation of agreement with the old protestant creeds, from a partial to an entire rejection of them, with substitution of the bible, or of a new creed in their place, from this to an absolute rejection of every systematic exposition of doctrine generally, nay even to the separation of the clerical office from every objective basis, and making it dependent entirely on the temporary spirit of the day."

"There has been no want in the churches of neighbouring countries of struggles of single religious parties with the positive or negative creeds of the churches to which they originally belonged. But when it has become evident that such disputes cannot be settled, then either the opposing minorities were cast out, or they themselves seceded from the church and constituted themselves on their own responsibility. Accordingly their dissent comprehended a protest against a false creed in itself, but never against creeds in themselves. . . . With us, however, the course of matters was quite different. . . . Our protests against creeds, when they had once arisen, did not appear as the result of an isolated, party-originating, but of a universal, national, development; and hence it grew so generally and powerfully, so silently and gradually, and for that very reason so compactly, that a dissent from the church was not to be thought of."

And the consequence is, that within the bosom of the church itself this dispute has been now long raging and still continues to do so.

Now the difference in the outset between the German mode of treating a heresy that arises within its churches,

and that of other countries, is worth notice, as it may help us to the solution of the difficulty that this question should have been agitated amongst them so actively and so long, and not yet even approach to a settlement. English heretics finding themselves pledged to something they cannot believe, fix upon the point in question, raise a discussion about it, and if they cannot succeed in getting it expunged from the essential doctrines of their church, they secede and become a new church in themselves. German heresy arises perhaps in the same way; the creeds are found unbelievable, but if this scepticism arouse rebuke or contest, the doctrinal point is lost sight of immediately, and the whole dispute turns into the abstract question, "Is the mind to be bound to a creed at all?" With *us* the repugnance is to the false *doctrines*—with *them* it is to the *state* of fettered feeling in which they find themselves:—with *us* it is indignation at the falsehood of the *thing to be believed*, directed to the *object* of belief;—with *them* it is displeasure at the *state of mind* to which they are urged, directed to the subjective *attitude of belief* in the falsehood, not to the falsehood itself. Hence in the one case a discussion as to the truth or falsehood of the doctrine is final: in the other it is perfectly immaterial; the discussion turns on the point whether any right exists to force them *in any case* to a definite profession of opinion. It will be seen at once that this state of things is a remarkable confirmation of the view of the national character taken at the commencement of this article. The subjective state of belief occupies with them the attention that *we* turn on the object to be believed, so that we get a doctrinal controversy, where *they* have a dispute about abstract right. The same observation may help to explain the difficulty that they appear to have in settling a question that has been agitated so long.

"The purpose of the church," says our author, "is the living restoration of the purity of the inner and outer relations of man to God and to his brother man, through an incessant contest with sin."—"A church is in the most general formal comprehension of its idea, a community of faith. As such it must know what its faith is, and be in a condition to declare it. The like is true of what its faith is *not*, and of that by which, when known to be a part of the faith of others, it will distinguish itself from these others. By placing together its articles of faith, and an express or implicit sepa-

ration of the same from that which is not its faith, we obtain a confession, a creed. Every church, and every community taking measures to become one, has made some confession, set forth some kind of creed. Those who join in making confession of the faith thus laid down are members of the church; those who do not join in making this confession, or who cease to do so, bear no relation, or cease to bear a relation, to the church. Has the church appointed an official teacher, then this teacher teaches the faith which is in accordance with the confession of the church; and should the faith of the church cease to be the faith of this official teacher, then his confession is of course at an end, and consequently his official functions."

Now these passages (clearly as they are written) contain, we believe, much error as to the real nature and objects of the church, and error which we believe has not been easily detected, from the peculiar national tendency we have attributed to the German mind. If we were correct in ascribing to it a great preponderance of the subjective element of thought and feeling over the objective, it would follow of course that those feelings would be most likely to be deficient or weak which are necessarily bound up with their objects, which rivet the mind on something external, concentrate it on the object without the mind, and do not allow it to dwell on the subjective feeling of pleasure or pain caused within. A remarkably objective feeling is that of reverence, the attitude of looking upwards to something higher, holier, greater, more mysterious than ourselves: it is essentially necessary to keep the mind fixed on the venerated object, for immediately it retires into subjective contemplation the reverence ceases, as the attitude of looking up is exchanged for one of looking within. And this feeling, so essential to worship, seems to be deficient in German religion; hence the elements that constitute their worship are much more those that man feels as a *consequence* of divine action in or to himself, than that which man feels only *for* God. Thus moral elements, of indignation against sin, submission to the laws of conscience, preponderate the most; but these are merely states of feeling pleasing to God as agreeing with his own nature, not properly religious at all, as not called forth by God's personality: then love and gratitude take their place, but these though really religious affections as being felt *to* God

are consequences of his blessings and love to man, subjective feelings that do not require the mind to fix itself wholly on the thought of God, but merely contemplate his action, *in the mind* of the individual. But veneration, the feeling which is fixed on him as an object not as an agent, on his power, goodness, mysteriousness, immutability, and infinity, does not seem to take much place in German worship. Now if this be so, then it is not wonderful that the Germans should lose sight of what seems to be the true object of a church, to express together the common feelings of worship towards God, to indulge religious *sympathies* by the common acts of prayer and praise. If a church be then a means of expressing the religious affections,—and not *primarily* an instrument for *any* ulterior ends, even though they be moral ends,—then it follows of course that common religious affections are the basis of union in its members, or in other words common faith; since faith is in reality the formation of the affections, and may be distinguished from simple belief or intellectual assent to a logical proposition. But if this be so, a *Christian* faith must be one where the affections for God are trained up through reverence and love for Christ; and hence the *personal life* of Christ is the primary bond of union in a Christian church, as his life can alone rouse our affections, his doctrine only appealing to our intellect. Hence it seems to us that the real faith which a Christian church must have in common is not a doctrine of common belief, but a feeling of common reverence and love; and that this dispute in German theology owes its length to the fact that the character of the German mind is, too much to lose itself in the subjective feeling, instead of going out of itself to seek a common object for its affection and then keeping its attention reverentially fixed on that object. While the freedom of German thought would not be bound to a fixed object like a creed and so chained in the prison of a system, German feeling (had it gone in search of a common object) might have found a centre round which it could gather without any compromise of freedom; and then the bond of union would have been a true spiritual bond, the sympathy of affection, not the mere fact of intellectual assent which (so long as it is simply intellectual) cements no union between minds. So far as our author insists on the necessity of the creeds he

advocates being a *result* of moral sympathy and conviction, we think him perfectly wise; for the mere intellectual belief, without some surer basis, could produce no lasting union at all; but why does he seek for that union simply in a distant result or consequence of moral feeling, when he may go to the *source* of a common moral admiration and of all other affection for the uniting bond he needs? It is the natural tendency of German thought to seek the common tie in the subjective feeling itself rather than in an *object* of feeling; otherwise we might be inclined to wonder that this solution of the long-agitated creed question had not made greater progress in Germany, and superseded a mental yoke to which the spirit of her restless intellect will never bow. It is very interesting to observe the entirely different views taken not only by our author but by most of the educated German religionists on the connection of the church and state, from those prevalent amongst the same religious denominations in England. The theory of a purely police-state, of a society for the protection of body and goods, seems perfectly hateful to the German mind; and as the peculiarity of that mind is, to be fixed rather on the mental states than the outward practical objects of life, it cannot be wondered at that it is so. We must give a very brief statement of the result to which his examination comes.—The Christianity of the state rests essentially on its character as a moral community. But as the moral life can only be properly nourished under the influence of the Christian religion, it becomes an essential duty of the state to care for the Christian education of its members. But as it is an essential principle of Protestantism that faith must be acquired by *personal* inquiry, effort, and aspiration alone; and as the result of this in various individual minds must be expected to lead to considerable individual variety of creed, provision must be made in the machinery of the state for more than one form of protestantism; allowance must be granted for the peculiar processes of individual thought in conducting to different modifications of the same great truths. At the same time the state must not be *expected* to acknowledge any sect that presents itself for support, unless its faith on examination is found to include those essentials of Christianity that are generative of the *moral* ends which the state is always

to keep in view. Hence a confession of faith must be demanded from any new religious bodies petitioning for support; and so long as the essential moral doctrines which Christianity alone set forth and can alone generate are not found wanting, that support should be granted. It is of course to be understood as a condition that the number of petitioners should be large enough to warrant the state in the necessary expenditure. This conduct of the state towards religious bodies not recognizing the essential moral doctrines of Christianity (as its theory of original sin and justification by faith) should be simply one of neutrality, as rather wanting positive moral principles than introducing immoral ones. Hence there are four relations in which the state may stand to religious bodies under its government. (1.) Its relation to the acknowledged churches of the nation, as in Germany to the Catholic, the Lutheran, and the Calvinistic or Reformed Church.

"These the state partially maintains from its own means, to their acts it gives a certain public validity, in their external administration it exercises certain rights, it has regard to their peculiarities in the organization of its system of national education, and it gives them corporate constitutions, and allows to their members the exercise of complete civil rights.—(2.) Dissenting Churches—or those to which the state might likewise grant the above rights and advantages, and actually does grant more or fewer of them; but the putting which on a complete equality with the former is deferred for a time from the proportionally small number of their members.—(3.) Parties who are yet in their first stages of formation, and relatively to which the state still holds in suspension all except the personal rights of its members.—(4.) Tolerated sects who without being immoral do not in their essential character harmonize with the full idea of the state, and to which, therefore, the state permits a certain limited, exceptional existence."

As our readers are probably well acquainted with the principal points of the German Catholic movement, we shall not think it necessary to follow our author through the laborious attempt to refute the opinions of Professor Gervinus, that the simple principles which they had adopted are those alone eventually capable and fit to form the basis of a universal national church. The fundamental principles of the Lutheran church are defended as having the element of union, in those strong moral feel-

ings in which the more modern schismatics are wanting.—The principles and origin of the German-Catholic movement are very nearly allied with those of the Saxon and Prussian *Lichtfreunde*; excepting of course that the one was a schism from the Catholic, the other from the Protestant church.—Both have been chiefly occupied with the question of creed or no creed, in both it has been rather a general revolt from the intolerable burden of spiritual oppression, than a mere disagreement on isolated points or creeds. As the movement of these Friends of Light is little known in England, we shall attempt to give a somewhat fuller account of it than the mere sketch prefixed by our author to his examination of their claims.*—The union of the protestant Friends was first entered into in the year 1841, under the guidance of Pastor Uhlich, at Pömmelte, in the Province of Saxony. Uhlich was incited to his scheme by the fact that a clergyman in Magdeburg was threatened with dismissal because he had declared himself openly against prayer to Christ. The two principles proposed at the first meeting were "Opposition to all powers hostile to the free development of Religion," and "Extension of the kingdom of God in freedom with united powers." They continued to be the basis of the union.

The first meeting of the Association took place on the 29th of June 1841, at Gnadau: it was attended by sixteen of the clergy, as the association was originally meant to be one amongst the clergy merely for the consideration of theological and ecclesiastical questions, to guard their freedom and to promote religious discussion. At this meeting the following declaration was drawn up as to the tendency of the association.

"(1.) We would strengthen ourselves in our present faith and develope it still further by mutual counsel.—(2.) Our faith is the simple evangelical Christian faith. Its fundamental principles are announced in the words of Jesus, 'This is eternal life, to know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou has sent.'—(3.) We recognise it as our right and duty, to examine with our reason, to receive and work out all that offers itself to us as Religion.—

* We have taken this account partially from a little pamphlet published at Leipzig, under the name "*Die wichtigsten Actenstücke zur Geschichte der Protestantischen Bewegung unserer Tage, von Bruno Theobald,*" and partially from the pamphlets of the leaders of the movement.

(4.) We recognise that, beginning with the Apostles, a continually different conception of Christianity has prevailed, and that this, owing to the variety in human minds, cannot be otherwise; and therefore is God's will. Hence we consider it our duty to honour every form that it has assumed as rightful, so far as men have laboured sincerely in its cause. We will never stigmatize any as heretics. (5.) In order that Christianity should endure and bring its blessing, we recognize three conditions to be fully sufficient—its divinity, the eternal wants, and spiritual freedom of the human mind. Further support than this, Christianity does not need and will not accept. One body, 'one church,' it will form for itself according to its wants at any given time. (6.) But we recognise as our first and most important task to prove ourselves faithful in our office and life. This we promise one another as we have long been obliged to promise God. He who does not keep faith, belongs no longer to us. (7.) Moreover we will truly assist one another in counsel and deed, in order that we may hit the right, in our office and life. Also we will work around us (as much as is permitted to us) for the kingdom of Jesus, by speaking and writing. We delight in the consciousness that we stand in respect to our faith and endeavours on the ground of the Protestant church, which is even Christ. Externally we are on our guard against every spiritual superintendence. We call ourselves therefore "Protestant Friends."

From this association arose by degrees the large body of *Lichtfreunde*. Already at its second meeting, which was held at Halle, laymen joined it. They assembled the third time at Leipzig, and from the fourth time onwards at Köthen. Here their numbers continued to increase till the year 1844, the meetings at Köthen swelled into popular assemblies, over whom Uhlich presided as the head. The Prussian government presented no opposition at first to these meetings. On the 29th of May 1844, Wislicenus, the pastor of a church in Halle, made a speech before the meeting at Köthen, in which he attacked the inspiration of the scriptures (it was known under the name of the speech on "Letter or Spirit," *ob Schrift? Ob Geist*), and that not merely the verbal inspiration, but universally their right to exercise any kind of weight over the mind beyond that which, as works of entirely human origin, they would have a right when judged by the standard of reason to acquire. The speech was in fact grounded on ultra Rationalistic principles which will allow only so far of a Christian

interpretation that he gives Christianity the highest place among positive religions, though he does not profess to assume toward it the attitude of a disciple, but simply of a candid, independent inquirer. This speech called forth the most violent storm. The substance of his speech was brought before the public by an orthodox Professor in Halle, and Wislicenus was suspended. The orthodox party in the church protested in great numbers against Wislicenus, and declared him not to belong to the protestant church.—Wislicenus replied to the attacks upon him by a pamphlet, in which he vindicated at greater length the views of his speech, and defended himself from the charges of dishonesty; though renouncing altogether the *authority* of Christ as a peculiarly inspired teacher, and rather giving Christianity its *fair weight* in the formation of his religion of natural reason than considering it as adding any entirely new element of faith, he still of course lays claim to the Christian name.—He rejects in it all the supernatural stories of the old and new testament, beginning with the creation, and ending with the resurrection of Christ, and does not universally find even in the new testament “the highest development and the purest expression of the holy spirit,” but on the contrary finds some perverted moral views amongst the lessons of Christ. The protests against Wislicenus were not left unanswered. Uhlich went about addressing enormous assemblies of people, and gave the movement the character of a complete agitation.—It should be observed that the Lichtfreunde as a body by no means pledged themselves to all the views of Wislicenus, and with a large portion of them he lost his popularity. However, the bigotry that his speech had called forth, roused the feeling of the public for some time in his favour, and protests in large numbers were drawn up in his defence, some pledging themselves more, some less, to his principles, but all defending his right of free thought. The signatures to those most numerous signed considerably exceeded 10,000 names, as in the protest from Breslau. By a cabinet order of the 5th August 1845, and a rescript of the minister of the interior on the 10th August, every open assembly and also the constitution of private societies of protestant friends, under whatever name, were strictly forbidden. This prohibition was an-

nounced to the interested teachers, and when occasions of the kind arose was actually carried into effect by the police. Contests on paper now supplied the place of meetings.—On the 2nd of October 1845 a petition was presented to the king by the Berlin magistrate requesting a commission from all the provinces to devise a free church constitution in which the members of the churches should have voices, in order that the liberal party might be safe from the attacks of the orthodox. The king answered by an emphatic denial of the right to present such petitions, with severe comments on its nature. Similar petitions were presented subsequently by the magistrates of Breslau and Königsberg and dismissed with equal unsuccess.—With this the movement began to subside! the measure which would have ensured popularity, protection, and even temporary success to a similar English agitation, appears to have answered its purpose with the German religionists, and to have subdued their revolt from the spiritual yoke of the state-church. Wislicenus declined in popularity with the Protestant Friends, and in an attempt in 1846 to ground a free moral community, was abandoned by the greater portion of his former supporters, who saw on the whole no sufficient reason for a secession from the national church.

In Königsberg there was a small separate branch of the same movement which led to the foundation of the *first* dissenting church which the history of German Protestantism has ever known. In 1845, Dr. Rupp, pastor of one of the churches in Königsberg, preached openly against the damnatory clauses of the creed of Saint Athanasius. His view appears to have been, that as the three creeds of their church (the Athanasian, Nicene, and Apostles!) profess to be in accordance with Scripture, the duty of the clergy to the confessions of faith is not simply to believe them, but examine if they are credible! He states it as the theory of the German church, that its ministers should hold their *belief* only to the Holy Scriptures, and that to this they are *bound*; but that the confessions of faith, as only expressing the deductions that the church thinks may be made from the Scriptures, are constantly liable to verification and correction, if any disagreement shall be proved to exist between them. This statement of the

principle of the Protestant church as to her creeds seems perfectly groundless; and it would be strange if it were not so; for, had such unlimited power over the three creeds really been placed in the hands of the clergy, how long a time would have elapsed before it had become too evident even to the warmest theological zeal, that this three-headed Cerberus of the church was in danger of losing entirely the two abnormal features which had so long remained her protection and her pride? However this may be, Dr. Rupp was dismissed for his temerity, and consequently seceded with a part of his congregation, and founded the first dissenting German protestant church. Its fate, however, has been unfortunate; a party of the dissentients going the lengths of Wislicenus, while Dr. Rupp himself adheres firmly to the inspired writings. A second schism has taken place, and it is at present intended by each party to raise an independent church for its own worship.

Such is a brief account of the movement of the German Protestant Litchfreunde, a movement which (though from quite different reasons than our author's) it is impossible for us to contemplate with much heartfelt satisfaction. It is too clear to one who reads the writings of the chief movers, that theological rancour and an offended intellectual pride, supply far too much the place of the moral enthusiasm which can alone give these spiritual insurrections dignity, and render their results enduring. In the spirit of Uhlich alone do we see much of the moral earnestness which we desire, and that is of a far different kind from the passionate hatred of sin which in Luther was a spiritual necessity rather than the result of conscientious conviction; it is far more the active efforts of a naturally practical mind, convinced that there was good to be done, and deeply anxious to do it, but not led on by the kind of irresistible impulse or passion which alone enabled the great Reformer to throw off the authority under which Europe for centuries had groaned. Uhlich was rather fitted (as it seems to us) for an active co-operator in a great reform than for its leader. And to the whole movement we have this insuperable aversion, that it took place *within* the church in whose faith they no longer believed, whose doctrines and creeds were a laughing-stock to

all. The rationalistic spirit in Germany had been growing up for more than a century within the orthodox church, and these reformers defended themselves from the imputation of dishonesty in joining and remaining in a church to which they no longer really belonged, by alleging the notorious fact that the rationalistic views were *knowingly* admitted into the church by those appointed to examine and ordain its clergy. This was certainly the fact; but it required the assistance of the most unpardonable falsehood to render this laxity of official strictness of any avail. The passage of the ordination service in the Prussian dominions which has reference to the faith of the new candidate runs thus: "You are accordingly enjoined, first to preach and spread no other doctrine than that which is grounded in the sincere and clear word of God, the prophetic and apostolic writings of the Old and New Testament, our only rule of faith, and recorded in the three chief creeds, the Apostolic, Nicene, and Athanasian, and also such as is accordant with the spirit of our church, and to follow which you are bound." And the candidate is to be asked "if he is ready to pledge himself to all this?" on which he must answer with "yes." Now what can be thought of the moral earnestness of those who should excuse themselves from the obvious obligation that this lays upon them to resign their posts when they no longer believe this, by alleging the inconsistency of the injunctions which it comprehends, or the notorious laxity of construction with which it was taken? To the former it is enough to reply that the very assertion of inconsistency is a denial of one of the principles to which they had pledged themselves, as in the opinion of the church the doctrine of the creeds and the Scripture is identical. To the latter we might reply, that every repetition of the crime of dishonesty rendered it more and more incumbent on the sincere, to enter their protest against this unholy union of religion and sin; and that, unblest assuredly would be an agitation which had crept into the church under the disguise of a pretended faith, and then used the very enormity of the crime, the very extent of this religious imposture, as a means of obliging the more honest believers to surrender the faith of their ancestors, and allow them to keep under the sanction of law, the position they had gained

by the meanest cowardice, the most wicked trifling with the first divine intuitions of conscience. It is the most startling proof of the want of real moral enthusiasm which could have alone made this movement successful or even great, that (except in the church at Königsberg, where the minister was dismissed) no schism took place, and that while their intellect was clamouring for freedom, no conscience stirred. It is the very stamp of true reform to begin with protest against all that is morally false, to recoil from untruths which have acquired the sanction of fashion and the prescription of age; to begin by rejecting what is insincere before it advances to destroy what is untrue. He whose conscience does not shrink from the immoralities of life will have no power to overthrow its errors. The flame that has not power to dissolve the binding crust of moral insincerity will never acquire the volcanic force to explode the hard stratum of lifeless creed that time deposits round religion. Wanting the heat of moral enthusiasm, it is the mere electric light caused by the collision of authority with the restless waves of intellectual pride.

And now we must draw this article to a conclusion. The sketch which is laid before us in the work which we have attempted to review, of the history and state of the German Protestant Church, has added another example to those already before us of the melancholy truth that in the noblest attempt which states have ever made, in their employment of the most powerful instrument for man's improvement, their culture of his religion, they have hitherto experienced a most remarkable and complete failure. Many who have observed this have been led hastily to conclude that under no circumstances could religious influences be encouraged by the aid of state machinery without essential detriment to the cause of truth. *We* cannot draw this inference. It seems to us that there is reason enough to account for the failure, in the essentially false form in which the idea of religion has been conceived in all states where the experiment has yet been tried. If it be indeed true (as we are persuaded that it is) that religion is generated not by our reason but by our affections, then what can be more mistaken than to hold up as the object which is to unite men in sympathy and incite them

to beneficence, as the object in fact of their common love, the hard and repulsive image of a creed? The infinite aspirations which are longing for worship recoil back on the soul of man from the dried up thing, and the hearts of the people grow callous as they feel the inward conviction that if that assemblage of stiff verbal propositions be religion, it is better to immerse themselves in the ever-glowing interests of social life. Strange it is that amidst all the disputes as to the right creed to embody the spirit of *Christianity*, none should ever have thought of CHRIST. Human life once became divine that man might receive an everlasting lesson, but instead of studying that lesson aright he deprived it of its human interest by divesting it of its human form; it was abstracted and developed into systems by theologians, embodied in articles of belief by councils, and tortured into catechisms by teachers of the young! No wonder that it lost its fresh breath of inspiration. For the attempt was one to embody in a scientific system what was meant to remain the object of our love. Now affection is in its very nature unscientific; and hence the great error of confusing the regions of philosophy and religion. Affection fixes at once upon the concrete, while philosophy abstracts and classifies. And hence the great eras in religious life, which have ever been marked by the flow of new affections, have not been preceded as a *cause*, but followed as a *consequence*, by the systems of philosophy formed in a newer school. Philosophy has analysed and reviewed the changes which religious forces have effected, but never been the power which produced them. And we might have learned the same lesson from a study of the providence of God. He implanted affection in us *at once*, and gave us its object ready in the concrete field of the universe; philosophy was as yet only a possibility in the mind, a power to analyse, separate and again unite the causes that acted around us. What nature is to science, that is religion to theology. We look round on the wondrous beauty of the physical world, and while rejoicing in the fresh influences and radiant glory that embrace us, we feel that gladness of satisfied affection for beauty and magnificence, which the revelation of the hidden causes that philosophy brings to light can neither increase nor diminish; and so also the acute reasoning and compact consist-

ency of theological systems, the doctrinal scheme of Christianity, cannot affect the spontaneous love with which the natural feelings of human nature would always bend in reverential worship before the beauty and sublimity of Christ.

ART. VI.—ASPLAND'S SERMONS.

Sermons on Various Subjects, chiefly Practical. By the late Robert Aspland, Minister of the New Gravel-Pit Chapel, Hackney. London: John Chapman, Newgate Street, 1847.—pp. 482.

WE profess ourselves no great readers of Sermons.—Yet our want of interest in this species of literature is occasioned—we must state in self-justification—not by its subject, but by its ordinary mode of treatment. Religion and duty are the grandest of all themes, lying close to the deepest, earliest wants of our mysterious frame; and like the objects of the outward world—the woods and hills and ever-circling stars—though celebrated age after age by prophets and bards, must possess an unfading freshness and beauty, would men only look at them earnestly with the eyes of their own minds, and, casting aside their technicalities and their conventionalisms, speak of them as they really believe and feel.—Few gifts would be more precious to the world, than the honest utterances of a prophet's heart. Few things could be studied with more profit, than the undisguised conclusions of a wise and thoughtful spirit, from his observation and experience of life.—What such a man has lived through, and reflected on, and gives back to the world, with the characters of his own moral individuality impressed on it—cannot fail to have the charm of novelty, though it should only be what happens to each one of us in passing from the cradle to the grave: and to be able to impart that gloss of novelty to themes that have been soiled and worn in the Schools—is the clearest indication of a great and powerful mind.

This merit attaches in no small degree to the volume before us.—We have read it through, almost continuously; and yet we have never had a sense of weariness: not that the discourses are all of equal excellence—not that the style does not at times border on the diffuse and the declamatory—not that the sentiments of the author are in every instance what we can regard as either profound or just;—but there is diffused through the

whole a certain tone of freshness and vigour, a nobleness and elevation of spirit—the sure witness of an active and pregnant intelligence—which makes his words tell with a living power on the mind of the reader, and cast upon it the rich lights of a large and varied acquaintance with men and things.

The late Mr. Aspland was for many years a distinguished leader not only of the Unitarians, but of the once united Nonconformist body of the Three Denominations, in those generous struggles for religious freedom and equality, which marked the earlier part of the present century. His efforts in this cause aimed at something far higher than the mere emancipation of a sect, and were prompted by an enlarged and enlightened sense of the claims of every human intellect.—Though a sincere believer in Revelation, and zealously attached to his own form of Christianity, he stood forward at a time, when such prominence incurred only obloquy and the grossest misrepresentation, as the intrepid and consistent asserter of the right of the Catholic, the Jew and the Deist, to the profession of their opinions and the exercise of their worship, unencumbered by the forfeiture of any political or social privilege.—His attachment to civil liberty, tempered by a wise reverence for the forms and usages of the British Constitution, was equally fearless and unswerving. With a well-cultivated and well-disciplined mind, thoroughly versed in the history, theology and general literature of his own country—he was pre-eminently a man of action, born to guide and to command; and if, with the common infirmity of our nature, he had some of the peculiarities incident to such a temperament—perhaps the condition of its associated excellence—they are all thrown into the shade, on a survey of his useful and noble life, by the remembrance of his generous spirit, his large philanthropy, his unwearied energy in the pursuit of the public good, and his contempt for every thing narrow, slavish and hypocritical.—The spirit of the man survives in his book.—It bears on every page the strongest impress of his mind and character, softened by a copious infusion of deep devotional feeling, and displaying more human tenderness and a readier sympathy with the gentle and domestic affections, than many who had known him only in the public relations of life, might be prepared to expect.

What we most like in the volume, is its masculine and practical tone.—It is the production of one who knew the world, had studied man and life, and dealt with realities—not the fancy work of a mere chamber student, dwelling amidst dreams, and trafficking in words.

These Discourses were selected from Mr. Aspland's papers, and have been given to the public with great feeling and good taste, by his Son.* In the religious communion to which Mr. Aspland belonged, they will without a doubt be much read and highly esteemed. They deserve, and are fitted for, a much wider circulation: and should these words of unfeigned commendation chance to catch the eye of any reader, not otherwise likely to become acquainted with the Volume, we can only hope they may introduce him to a work, which is not meant to set forth the views of a particular sect, but addresses itself in a truly Catholic spirit to the Christian sentiment of every thoughtful and pious mind; which arrests the attention, if not by any passages of highly impassioned and imaginative oratory, yet by the sustained dignity and mingled vigour and sprightliness of its clear and manly style; and in its abstinence from all subtle doctrinal questions, in its keeping to the broad high-way of the Gospel morality, in its earnest enforcement of the paramount claims of conscience and duty, in its rational and benignant theology, in its hearty love of good men of all churches and religions—carries back our thoughts to the best productions of the old Latitudinarian school of the Church of England.

Mr. Aspland's Christianity is distinguished by a generous toleration for the errors of all sincere and earnest minds. There is much wise and admirable reflection on this subject in the Discourse on Scepticism, which shows that he had conversed closely with his own heart, and had watched narrowly the workings of other men's minds. We have not a little sympathy with the mellowed conservatism of feeling which pervades the Sermon on Ancestry and Posterity. In the Addresses to the young, we have been much struck with a solemn and earnest pathos, springing evidently from a sagacious perception of

* A preceding volume with the same title was published during the Author's lifetime, in 1833.

the many perils of life, from generous sympathy with the erring and inexperienced, and a profound insight into the true sources of human happiness. Mr. Aspland's observations are drawn rather from life than from books. He seems more familiar with truth in its concrete applications than its abstract apprehension. There is no tendency to the vague and mystical in his views of things. Occasionally in a few bold and vigorous touches—he gives you an expressive outline of character, not without a deep and tender under-tint of pathetic colouring. See some admirable specimens in the Sermon on Changes of Mind and Character.

We might instance the two Discourses on the Government of the Thoughts, and those on the Prodigal Son, and on the Rich Man and Lazarus, as proofs of the power which a vigorous and observant mind always possesses, of infusing freshness into themes, which have been so often handled, that one might suppose every element of interest and instruction had long since been exhausted.

We cannot yield unqualified assent to his suggestion (p. 159) of the desirableness of keeping a minute diary of the daily thoughts, as a means of self-discipline and self-purification. A different process may, we know, be required for different minds. But for the scrupulous and the sensitive, who often find the greatest difficulty in regulating the train of their thoughts, we believe that any practice, which should give increased prominence in the mind to their *personal* condition, would prove pernicious rather than beneficial. There are numbers who need to be carried out of themselves, and to have their minds healthfully fixed on external duties and innocent activity. To record facts of daily observation, or even to institute a careful analysis of internal states and processes of thought—may often indeed be a great help to knowledge; but the practice in this case is a scientific exercise and not a moral discipline. Our Puritan forefathers, we are aware, were in the constant habit of keeping religious diaries; but religion with them, shaped into the hard and definite form of an absolute creed, was an objective reality; and moreover, the robust vigour and hardy discipline of their outward life, prevented the practice from degene-

rating into a dreamy and corrupting sentimentalism. Yet even with them, we doubt whether it had not a narrowing effect on the mind, and did not generate spiritual selfishness and pride.

We cannot give a clearer idea of Mr. Aspland's conception of Christianity, than in the following powerfully written passage (p. 417):—

“There is not in reality a sound maxim in reasoning or science, or a just conclusion from history, or a truth built upon human nature, which does not agree with the grand moral principles of the gospel, as before described, and which does not directly or indirectly *point to them*. They have been spoken of, indeed, by those that make and those that bow down to and worship creeds, the worst idols that have come out of human hands, as *generalized Christianity*, as if all essential truth were not a generalization or induction from particulars. Did not one apostle generalize religion, when he resolved it all into the royal law of equity? Did not another generalize it when he declared the end of the law and the beginning of the Gospel commandments to be charity out of a pure heart? and did not our Lord himself generalise it, when he declared all the law and the prophets to be summed up and fulfilled in the love of God and the love of man? Here is divine authority for setting up great principles above forms and details—for magnifying the “weighty matters of the law” above “the tithing of herbs—the anise and the cummin” of creeds and ceremonies. These essential doctrines—rational and therefore Christian, moral and therefore powerful—are the spirit of truth, the spirit of God. All the vitality and power of every scheme of faith is owing to them, though they may be overlooked, and even for a time buried, in the huge mass of popular belief. When decomposed and disembodied, they will act with greater energy and produce fuller and wider social happiness. Christianity will then, in and by them, be glorified, and it will be acknowledged by wise and candid men, that a scheme of doctrine which will *bear* this reduction to the simplicity and purity of reason, which will be more like the original Gospel as it is thus reformed, and which in its simplest and purest state will be most efficacious in promoting love to God and good service to man—has within itself a witness of its truth, a witness strengthening with the succession of ages (for time sweeps away error and delusion) and growing with the vigour and activity of the human mind, before which all folly and falsehood are doomed finally to perish.”

There are some fine things nobly said in the Sermon on

Faith, and in the three connected Discourses on the question, Whether the Evidence for the Truth of Christianity be impaired by the lapse of Time; though we confess that in these, there are more points on which we feel ourselves obliged to dissent from the excellent author, than in any others contained in his volume. These points are related to our whole general conception of the historical evidence for Christianity, and of the origin and conditions of religious faith; and we could not satisfactorily explain our views respecting them, without a fuller investigation of a wide theoretical question, than would be consistent with this brief notice of a volume mainly practical.—With its practical conclusions we entirely agree. Its estimate of the nature, design, spirit and influence of Christianity is altogether our own. In the spirit of the following eloquent passage we cordially sympathise (p. 400) :—

“From looking at the first bud of a plant, who, beforehand, and without experience, could foresee the actual flower and fruit? In the babe just born, who, without knowledge of human nature, would expect to see hereafter man in all his strength and activity and intelligence and will and foresight? A word, a truth, may in like manner grow and disclose itself, and become more beautiful, more useful and more energetic. Truth is nothing but as some mind gives it existence and power. It grows, therefore, as the mind grows. The same word, the same truth, is of different force and value in different stages of human life, in different communities and in different periods of the world. Truth is that which, as far as it is perceived, is agreeable to the mind; it is the same as light to the eye, at first and naturally pleasant, in a healthy state of the faculties useful in its effects, and valued in the proportion of its being enjoyed. There will be more truth in the degree that reason grows in strength with regard to individuals, and is cultivated in communities. This growth and cultivation is in some respects the necessary result of experience, observation, intercourse, inquiry and discussion. Let it be granted that divine wisdom is contained in some form of words or system of doctrine, and it would seem to follow, as was to have been expected, that it will show itself more and more to the opening understanding of mankind; resembling the system of the heavenly bodies—another volume, indeed, of divine wisdom—which, though existing from the creation, is but now, in this late age of the world, becoming intelligible, and in some particulars visible to man.

“The powers of nature were always the same, though it is but of

yesterday that some of the more wonderful of them were discovered. Others, many others, no doubt yet sleep, because man has not found out how to awaken them. And may not the analogy hold with regard to moral and spiritual power? May not much of this be still latent? May there not be treasures in the divine wisdom as taught by the holy Jesus, to be discovered by intellectual industry and moral purity and a more intense piety and devotion? Truth may thus become its own evidence, shining more and more to the perfect day. And is not this agreeable to all our highest thoughts of the Divine Providence, and in some measure conformable to the past history of our species and to our own experience? Certainly, no surer stamp of the hand of Heaven could be imprinted upon a religion designed for all nations and all ages, than that, defying the power of chance and time, it should become more intelligible and more acceptable in the exact proportion that the succession of minds occupied in its investigation throw upon it more light and derive from it more power!"